This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

B 874,448


1837
ARTES
VERITAS
SCIENTIA
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
TUEBOR
SI QUAERIS PENINSULAM AMOENAM
CIRCUMSPICE

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

GLASGOW ARCHÆOLOGICAL SOCIETY

NEW SERIES. Vol. III.

GLASGOW
Published for the Society by
JAMES MACLEHOSE & SONS, ST. VINCENT STREET
Publishers to the University
MDCCCXCIX

GLASGOW: PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
BY ROBERT MACLEHOSE AND CO.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME III.

PAGE

AN ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY OF THE UNITED KINGDOM. THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF OUR ANCIENT MONUMENTS. BY DAVID MURRAY, LL.D., F.S.A.; PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY, 1

THE HALL OF THE VICARS CHORAL, GLASGOW CATHEDRAL. BY THE MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP EYRE, LL.D., D.D., WITH SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE BY P. MACGREGOR CHALMERS, F.S.A. SCOT., . . 77

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE "KINGIS QUAIR." BY J. T. T. BROWN, . 93

NOTES ON A PRECEPT OF INFEFTMENT GRANTED BY QUEEN ANNE OF DENMARK, WIFE OF JAMES VI., AS LADY DUNFERMLINE, A.D. 1601. BY T. ETHERINGTON COOKE, ... 167

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON HISTORIES OF INVENTIONS AND BOOKS OF SECRETS (SECOND SUPPLEMENT). BY JOHN FERGUSON, LL.D., F.S.A. LOND. AND SCOT., REGIUS PROFESSOR OF CHEMISTRY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW, ... 175

NOTES ON A BRASS CUP FOUND IN THE CHURCHYARD OF RODIL IN THE ISLAND OF HARRIS. BY DAVID MURRAY, LL.D., F.S.A.; PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY, ... 214

ANNUAL EXCURSIONS OF THE SOCIETY FOR 1895 AND 1896, . . 238

ANNALS OF THE SOLWAY—UNTIL A.D. 1307. BY GEORGE NEILSON, F.S.A. SCOT., ... 245

388277

PAGE

TORPHICHEN AND THE KNIGHTS OF ST. JOHN OF JERUSALEM IN SCOTLAND. BY JOHN EDWARDS, F.S.A. SCOT., ... 309

TWO CHAMPIONS OF THE COVENANT. BY R. HERBERT STORY, D.D., LL.D., F.S.A. SCOT., PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW; VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY, ... 340

ST. KESSOG AND HIS CULTUS IN SCOTLAND. BY JAMES MURRAY MACKINLAY, M.A., F.S.A. LOND. AND SCOT., ... 347

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON HISTORIES OF INVENTIONS AND BOOKS OF SECRETS (THIRD SUPPLEMENT). BY JOHN FERGUSON, LL.D., F.S.A. LOND. AND SCOT., REGIUS PROFESSOR OF CHEMISTRY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW, ... 360

YULE AND CHRISTMAS: THEIR PLACE IN THE GERMANIC YEAR. BY ALEXANDER TILLE, PH.D., ... 426

RECENT ARCHÆOLOGICAL DISCOVERIES IN THE PARISH OF LESMAHAGOW. BY JAMES YOUNG, LESMAHAGOW, ... 498

ANNUAL EXCURSION OF THE SOCIETY FOR 1897, ... 504

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

PAGE

GLASGOW CATHEDRAL—SECTION OF LOW BUILDING AT N.W. CORNER OF LOWER CHURCH, SHOWING ELEVATION OF PART OF WEST BAY OF CHOIR, ... *To face* 77

GLASGOW CATHEDRAL—PLAN AND NORTH ELEVATION OF LOW BUILDING AT N.W. CORNER OF LOWER CHURCH, . . . *To face* 80

BRASS CUP FOUND AT RODIL, HARRIS, ... 215

CHALICE IN THE MONASTERY OF KREMSMUNSTER, GERMANY, . . 217

SILVER MASSING CHALICE, 13TH CENTURY, FORMERLY AT BERWICK ST. JAMES, WILTSHIRE, NOW IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM, . . 227

PEWTER COFFIN CHALICE, 13TH CENTURY, FROM CHEAM, SURREY, . 228

PEWTER COFFIN CHALICE FOUND AT RHOSCROWTHER, PEMBROKESHIRE, ... 229

BISHOP TULLOCH'S CHALICE, ... 231

PEWTER COFFIN CHALICE FOUND IN BERVIE CHURCHYARD, . . 232

THE SOLWAY. GENERAL SKETCH MAP, ... *To face* 245

" FROM MAP OF DEBATABLE LAND, 1552, . " 253

" FROM 14TH CENTURY MAP, ... " 257

PAGE.

THE SOLWAY. FROM AGLIONBY'S "PLATT," 1590, . . *To face* 257

" FROM CRAWFORD'S MAP, 1832, . . . " 260

FLAG OF THE REV. JOHN HEPBURN, 1715, ... " 340

STONE IMPLEMENT, BRONZE CELT, AND STONE CELT FOUND AT LESMAHAGOW, ... *To face* 499

URNS FOUND AT KNOCKEN, LESMAHAGOW, ... " 500

No. I.

AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

THE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION OF OUR ANCIENT MONUMENTS.

BY

DAVID MURRAY, LL.D., F.S.A.,

PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY.

[*An Address delivered at the Annual General Meeting, held on 21st November*, 1895.]

ARCHAEOLOGY A SCIENCE.

It is only within the last sixty years that Archaeology has taken rank as a science. It found no place in Whewell's *History of the Inductive Sciences*,[1] because it did not then exist. It had scarcely been recognized when *The Manual of Scientific Enquiry* was issued by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty in 1849, and it has not even yet been included in that valuable handbook, although in recent editions Anthropology has been added. The collecting and the study of the relics and monuments of man in past ages used to be known as "Antiquities," but the past meant the historic past, and the "antiquities" of a country was another name for its early history. The monuments of the past, it was thought, were not capable of being themselves interrogated, but as requiring to be interpreted by the facts of history.[2] Where record failed, tradition, in the

[1] London, 1837, 3 vols. 8vo.

[2] There were some exceptions. An instance is John Williams's *Essay on the Vitrified Forts of Scotland; An Account of some remarkable Ancient Ruins lately discovered in the Highlands and Northern Parts of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1777, 8vo). Williams proceeded

shape of legend, was pressed into the service, and the wildest fables were conventionally accepted as authentic. Archbishop Ussher's chronology[1] was the limit of the historic period, and the Bible narrative was regarded as the oldest and most reliable source of civil history. Under these conditions "antiquities" made little progress; antiquaries, in the absence of facts, resorted to conjecture, and were often led to propound the most ridiculous theories.

The establishment of the great Museum at Copenhagen, under the charge of Christian Thomsen, resulted in a revolution. The proper arrangement of the vast quantity of material which had been brought together was a matter of primary importance, and to this Thomsen devoted his most earnest thought and solved the problem with the most brilliant success. The secret of his success lay in his having command of a number of examples so large as to enable comparisons to be made, and in seeing that the characteristics which would be disclosed by comparison were of value.[2] Taking advantage of his opportunities, he compared the objects,

---

entirely upon observed facts and scientific experiment, and the question of the object and method of vitrifaction stands nearly as he left it, notwithstanding much subsequent writing and discussion. The evidence upon which he proceeded was insufficient, and he sometimes drew inferences where he could have observed, but he deserves credit for dealing with facts only. Fortunately there was no tradition and no current theory to mislead him. He had a clear idea of the value of ancient monuments. "By remains of antiquity we can often trace the progress or decline of the arts, the era of any practice or custom, or the time when any particular people or community flourished. And these monuments serve for ocular remembrancers that such people did flourish in such countries or neighbourhoods." *Op. laud.*, p. 72.

Twenty years earlier a suggestion had been made for the opening of cairns and barrows for the purpose of ascertaining facts bearing upon the former occupation and history of Scotland. *The Scots Magazine*, 1759, p. 462.

[1] It need scarcely be pointed out that the Bible narrative itself gives no dates. The Chronologies founded upon the Bible are merely calculations taken from the genealogies in Genesis; yet, curiously, they were accepted as authentic long after the "days" of creation had been interpreted as periods of indefinite duration. Thus Edmund Halley, while taking the human period at 6000 years, insisted on a long although definite period for the age of the Earth. He proposed to calculate it from an estimate of the rate at which the saltness of the sea increases. *Philosophical Transactions*, xxix. (1715), p. 296.

[2] Cf. Bosanquet, *The Essentials of Logic*, pp. 143, 144 (London, 1895).

noted their essential features, and so reduced them to types or classes. He thus learned that the articles of stone were intended for use, and had been used as utensils, implements, tools, and weapons of various kinds. He found a similar series of bronze articles and another of iron. Investigation showed that what were believed to be the most ancient graves contained utensils of stone only; those of later date contained bronze utensils, or bronze and stone together; the most recent contained iron. He next argued that as stone existed as material, and was everywhere at hand, its use must have preceded that of the metals, which are the product of skill and technical knowledge; and then that, as iron is still used for ordinary tools and weapons, while bronze is not, the use of iron for these purposes must have been later than that of bronze.

> Inde minutatim processit ferreus ensis,
> Vorsaque in obscenum species est falcis ahenae.[1]

Such was the genesis, about the year 1836,[2] of the now famous "three-age-system" of the Northern antiquaries, which, subject to some qualifications and limitations, is accepted[3] as representing the general sequence of the

---

[1] Lucretius, *De Natura Rerum*, v. 1282-1294. Munro reads, *in obprobrium*, "the bronze articles went out of use." See also Ovid, *Fasti*, iv. 405, whose "*chalybeia massa latebat*" is a reproduction of Hesiod's *μέλας δ'οὐκ ἔσκε σίδηρος* (*Opera et Dies*, 150).

[2] In 1833 Thomsen gave an outline of his suggestions in the *Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires du Nord*; but it was only in 1836 that he published his classification in *Ledetraad til Nordisk Oldkyndighed*, translated into German the following year by C. Paulsen, and into English by the Earl of Ellesmere in 1848 as *A Guide to Northern Antiquities*.

[3] The "three-age-system" has been much and sharply criticized by German antiquaries. See Hostmann, *Studien zur vorgeschichtlichen Archäologie* (Braunschweig, 1890, 8vo). Lindenschmit, *Die Alterthümer unserer heidnischen Vorzeit*, vol. ii., Preface (Mainz, 1870). In France, M. Alexandre Bertrand maintains that the system is not applicable to France in the same unqualified manner as it is to Scandinavia. This is true, but while details vary, the general outline is the same. M. Gabriel de Mortillet, on the other hand, accepts the "three-age-system" as applicable in its entirety to France; but points out that to mark the stages of culture in France it is necessary to subdivide the ages and to distinguish various epochs, which is just another method of qualifying the general proposition. The editor of *La Grande Encyclopédie* (i., p. 788, s.v. "Age") inserts articles by both, each

stages in the history of human progress—the visible expression of successive phases of culture.[1] The idea was not new. It is as old as the poet-philosopher of the first century, and had become a commonplace with the antiquaries of the eighteenth century. But with them it was an assumption. With Thomsen it was a demonstration, a logical inference from observed facts. In this lies its value, and whatever modifications have been made or limitations placed on Thomsen's general statement, they are the result of further and closer observation. Archaeology is therefore founded upon the results of observation and inference, and has taken the place of "Antiquities," the interpretation of the past by means of written records.

Archaeology and geology, proceeding from opposite directions, have joined hands. By patient and accurate observation geologists have unrolled the story of the earth, and have placed before us a panorama of successive changes and progressive phases of development. First, we have land and sea alike without life, animal or vegetable; then, beginning with the coral polypes of the Laurentian period, succeeded by the seaweeds and zoophytes, the graptolites and trilobites of the Silurian seas, we pass onwards first to the gigantic endogens and bone-clad fishes of the coal measures, and then to the true exogenous timber trees and huge mammalia of the tertiary age, and lastly we reach the quaternary period with vegetable and animal types gradually shading into those of the present day, and ending with *homo sapiens*, man himself. Starting from the present time, the archaeologist has worked backwards far behind the historic period, and has

---

advocating his own view. Bertrand's is reprinted in his *Archéologie Celtique et Gauloise* p. 10 (Paris, 1889).

One of the most significant testimonies to the Northern system is the fact that M. Salomon Reinach has translated the classical work of Montelius into French (Paris, 1895, 8vo), although another French translation already existed. The system has also been recently defended by Moriz Hoernes in *Mittheilungen der anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, xxiii. (1893), p. 71.

[1] The "ages" shade into each other and overlap. The presence of stone implements does not necessarily imply that they belong to the stone age, and to determine this other facts must be taken into consideration. The age of metals was posterior to that of stone, although in Western Europe it may have been an importation rather than a development, and it does not fit in with the *a priori* exactness that Thomsen and Worsaae demand.

made us acquainted with prehistoric man in two periods of development, an earlier and a later—palaeolithic man and neolithic man.[1] Some have argued that the human period extended back even into the tertiary age, and claim the existence of eolithic man.[2] If he did exist, he is the sole survivor of the tertiary fauna, and, as M. Reinach puts it, the hypothesis becomes a kind of scientific Noah's ark.[3] As yet, however, the advocates of this earlier man have failed to establish their case. The facts on which they found, in so far as concerns Europe, are the alleged discovery, in tertiary beds, of bones of man, of bones of animals showing cuts or breaks supposed to be the work of man, and of flints supposed to show traces of intentional chipping. It is not beyond dispute whether the deposits in which the bones were found really belong to the tertiary period; but, letting this pass, the marks on the bones of animals can be accounted for by their having come in contact with a sharp edge of stone, or as having been made by the teeth of other wild animals. The human bones seem to have come from interments of later date. The flints, however, still afford ground for discussion. The three principal finds are those of Thenay near Tours and Puy-Courny near Aurillac, both in France, and Otta in the Valley of the Tagus in Portugal. M. Gabriel de Mortillet maintains that these flints exhibit marks of intelligent action, but will not admit that they are the work of man. He attributes them to an intelligent precursor of man, whom he calls Anthropopithecus.[4] The only indication of artificial formation on the flints is "the bulb of percussion," but there seems little doubt that such bulbs are producible by natural causes, so that

---

[1] Some maintain that there was a special Copper Age in Europe prior to the Bronze Age, and immediately subsequent to, or rather contemporary with, the later Stone Age. See Much, *Die Kupferzeit in Europa, und ihr Verhältniss zur Kultur der Indogermanen* (Wien, 1886, 8vo); Gross in *Revue d'Anthropologie*, 3e S., iii. (1888), p. 726. This, however, is disputed by many eminent archaeologists. It is principally in Hungary that the evidences of a copper age exist.

[2] The term proposed by De Mortillet, *Le Préhistorique*, pp. 18, 21 (Paris, 1885, 8vo); *La Grande Encyclopédie*, i., p. 798.

[3] Reinach, *Antiquités nationales*, i., p. 96.

[4] De Mortillet, *Le Préhistorique*, p. 104; *La Grande Encyclopédie*, i., p. 798.

the intervention of the Anthropopithecus is not required. M. de Mortillet bases his case entirely on "reasoning founded on exact observations."[1] This, however, is just what his opponents dispute. They desiderate facts, the result of exact observation, and before the existence of tertiary man can even be provisionally admitted a very much larger volume of evidence, than is at present available, must be collected.

Archaeology, then, being founded on observation, comparison, and inference, it is essential that the material capable of being subjected to examination should be accurately ascertained and carefully protected and preserved. The historian deals with the written, the archaeologist with the unwritten or undesigned records of the past.[2] The latter are no less important than the former, although long familiarity with written records and the weight that is attached to written evidence may incline us to place greater value upon them. The contents of the State Paper Office and of other public and private repositories seem enormous; but however great may be the quantity, it is after all strictly limited; and when an isolated question of history has to be examined, the evidence available is often found to be meagre or doubtful. The loss of a single membrane from a roll may destroy everything that is to be learned of a particular transaction. The importance, therefore, of cataloguing and protecting all historical records—taken in the broadest sense—has been fully recognized by the Government of this and of most other countries for many years past, and much labour and large sums of money have been expended upon this object. That it is a wise expenditure no one disputes, and the various record publications grow in favour every day.[3] While so much attention

---

[1] See Bertrand, *La Gaule avant les Gaulois*, p. 27; Evans, *Ancient Stone Implements*, p. 247. Also the remarks of General Pitt-Rivers on the bulb of percussion, at the meeting of the British Association, 1894. *Nature*, l. (1894), p. 439.

[2] C. J. Thomsen styles written records, the immediate sources, monuments, the indirect sources, of history. *Guide to Northern Archaeology*, p. 25 (London, 1848). Lord Bute speaks of the "documents" of history and the "monuments" of history. *Journal British Archaeological Association*, xlv., p. 2.

[3] Last year there were no fewer than 50,000 applications at the Record Office for access to State Papers and Records.

is given to written records, little has been done by Government for our unwritten records, our ancient monuments. Almost every effort in this direction that has hitherto been attempted has been by private persons or learned societies, but their work has necessarily been imperfect, and without concert, and on no definite plan or system. The number of such monuments is even more limited than the documentary, and, considering the long period to which they relate, are comparatively far fewer in number. If one disappears or is destroyed, it is a loss that cannot be repaired, and hardly a week passes that we do not hear of some relic of antiquity perishing through neglect, or by mistake or design.[1] It is high time, therefore, that active steps should be taken to ascertain and register such monuments as remain, and to make due provision for their protection and preservation.

AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

The first thing to be done in the interest of our ancient monuments, it seems to me, is to have an Archaeological survey of the United Kingdom made by and at the expense of Government, similar to the Topographical and Geological surveys which have already been executed. That such a survey is practicable is proved by experience. That it would be of the very greatest service to science can hardly be questioned. The Rev. Alfred C. Smith has published a valuable archaeological map of the Downs of North Wiltshire on the scale of six inches to the mile, with a relative memoir.[2] Mr. George Payne has given us a similar map of Kent, but on a much smaller scale,[3] and Sir John Evans another of Hertfordshire.[4]

---

[1] David Ure, *History of Rutherglen and East Kilbride* (Glasgow, 1793), p. 210, notes the destruction that was going on a hundred years ago. John Williams, twenty years earlier, mentions the wholesale destruction of brochs. *An Account of some remarkable ancient ruins lately discovered in the Highlands and Northern Parts of Scotland*, p. 70 (Edinburgh, 1777).

[2] *Map of one hundred square miles round Abury: shewing the British and Roman Stone and Earthworks of the Downs of North Wilts.* 1884.

Guide to the British and Roman Antiquities of the North Wiltshire Downs in a hundred square miles round Abury: being a key to the large map of the above. 2nd ed., 1885, 4to.

[3] *Archaeologia*, li., p. 447.

[4] *Archaeologia*, liii., p. 247.

Some progress too has been made by the Congress of Archaeological Societies in union with the Society of Antiquaries in the preparation of archaeological maps of other parts of England. This is an heroic effort to overtake in part a necessary work, but it cannot take the place or have the authority of a general systematic survey, made under Government sanction,[1] and the maps are intended not for publication, but for reference in the hands of the societies for and by whom they are prepared. Apart from this, maps of this description are maps only in name. They are not the record of a survey, but are merely marked copies of sheets of the topographical survey. They are graphic representations or pictures of a rough kind, of the distribution of certain monuments, and indicate the whereabouts of certain finds. Much more is required. Each existing monument should be laid down from actual survey as exactly as a church or a lighthouse on the ordnance survey, and sites and places where finds occurred should be similarly treated.

A Government archaeological survey of certain provinces of India has been in progress for over thirty years.[2] The Archaeological Bureau of Denmark has for many years been engaged in the preparation of archaeo-

---

[1] As to the advantages of a professional survey, see Cochran-Patrick in *The Athenaeum*, March, 1879, p. 352; White, *Archaeological Sketches in Scotland*, i., p. 1 (Edinburgh, 1873, fol.).

The value of the work of a multitude of amateur observers depends entirely upon the editing. This necessitates a central staff of skilled men, who would be better employed in making original observations.

[2] The original survey was confined to Upper India. In 1873 the Government of Bombay was permitted to establish a survey of its own for the Western Presidency, and somewhat later the Government of Madras likewise directed its attention to the collection of notes regarding the antiquities of Southern India and to their scientific exploration. The more advanced native states subsequently followed in the same direction. See Buhler, "Notes on Past and Future Archaeological Explorations in India," in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, for 1895, p. 649; *Catalogue of . . . Reports . . . Maps, etc., of the Indian Surveys*, p. 77 (London, 1878). An Archaeological Survey of Ceylon has also been commenced.

The Government of India and the various Local Governments have also taken active steps for the protection and preservation of archaeological objects in India. In 1881 the Office of Curator of Ancient Monuments in India was created, and Major H. H. Cole, R.E., was appointed Curator.

logical charts of each parish, on which are indicated with precision the various objects of antiquarian interest. The Government of France in 1831, on the suggestion of Guizot, then Minister of Public Instruction, established a commission for the conservation of national monuments. In 1834, upon the initiative of M. Arcisse de Caumont, the *Société Française pour la conservation et la description des Monuments historiques* was formed for the purpose of aiding the commission and drawing up the monumental statistics of France. Under the authority of the Department of Public Instruction, the *Comité des Travaux historiques*[1] has published an archaeological repertory of France, and an archaeological dictionary of Gaul in the Celtic epoch has been begun and partly published. The *Commission de la Topographie des Gaules*, created in 1858 by the Emperor Napoleon III., and the *Commission de la Géographie historique*[2] have brought together a large quantity of material which has been utilized for various archaeological maps of ancient Gaul.[3] The same department is at present publishing an

---

[1] *Le Comité des Travaux historiques et des Sociétés savantes* was instituted in 1834 on the recommendation of Guizot, and placed under the Department (*Ministère*) of Public Instruction. See *infra*, p. 50.

[2] Instituted under Order of 20th January, 1880, by the Minister of Public Instruction for the purpose of completing the work of the *Commission de la Topographie des Gaules*. Its function is to bring together all that relates to the historical topography of France from the earliest times to the Revolution. It is now the fifth section of the *Comité des Travaux historiques*.

[3] One of these is the *Carte de la Gaule, depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à la Conquête Romaine, dressée avec le Concours des Sociétés savantes. Par la Commission spéciale instituée au Ministère de l'Instruction publique* (Paris, 1869, in 4 sheets).

M. Anthyme Saint-Paul announced his intention in 1876 of publishing a new archaeological map of France, but apparently this was never carried out. See *Congrès archéologique de France*, XLIIIe session (1876, Arles), p. 371. At the Paris Exhibition of 1877 a number of prehistoric maps of various departments were exhibited, and Ernest Chantre exhibited in MS. an atlas of the prehistoric archaeology of France. *Matériaux pour l'histoire primitive de l'homme*, xiii., p. 314. The *Géographie universelle* of Elisée Reclus contains (vol. ii., p. 32) a map of prehistoric France by M. de Mortillet, but on so minute a scale as to make it a mere clue or index. In the Archaeological Congress of France at Senlis, in 1877, the Comte de Maricourt presented an archaeological map of part of the arrondissement of Senlis, with relative memoir; XLIVe session, p. 22. See also *Ib.*, p. 301, as to the Department of l'Oise.

M. Cazalis de Fondouce has published an interesting note on archaeological maps with

When the Ordnance Survey of Ireland was commenced in 1825, General Colby, then Director-General of the survey, suggested that it should embrace not only a topographical survey, but also details of geology, antiquities, and other matters. The proposal was ultimately rejected on the score of expense, but it had been to some extent carried out in the survey of county Londonderry, and the preparation of a relative memoir. The memoir is illustrated with plans and sketches, and contains much useful archaeological information, and is the only thing that we have in this country of the nature of an official archaeological survey of a county.

Assuming that such a survey of the whole kingdom is to be made, by whom is it to be carried out? The case of county Londonderry is in point, and I have no doubt that the survey would be more correctly, usefully, economically, and expeditiously made if put under the charge of the Board of Ordnance directly, or in conjunction with the Science and Art Department, as in the case of the Geological Survey,[1] than if entrusted to any other body. The plan followed on the topographical survey of Scotland, of referring the officers of the survey to local persons for information on archaeological matters, was a bad one. The officers were to a large extent precluded from exercising their own judgment, and the authorities on whom they were instructed to rely must have been most haphazard. The staff employed on the archaeological survey need not be selected from specialists, or be under the direction of a specialist, and in many respects it would be better that it should not be. The required number of officers and men taken from the Royal Engineers could easily be trained to do the work. The preparation of the Archaeological Map of France, proposed by the *Comité historique des Arts et Monumens* in 1840, was entrusted to the military staff which was in charge of the topographical

---

[1] The Geological Survey was recognized as a branch of the Ordnance Survey in 1834: it was placed under the Office of Woods and Forests in 1845, and in 1854 it was transferred to the Department of Science and Art.

The Geological Survey of France is under charge of a Commission attached to the School of Mines, as regulated by Decree of 1st October, 1868. That of the United States is carried on by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, concurrently with the topographical survey.

map of the country.[1] The Archaeological Atlas of Tunis is founded upon the reports of the engineering staff of General Derrécagaix, who is in charge of the topographical survey of the protectorate. Acting upon special instructions, they note and report upon all remains of antiquity, supply plans of towns and buildings, and drawings or photographs of monuments.[2] The chief of the survey of the Roman *limes* in Germany is General von Sarwey, an accomplished engineer officer. The Archaeological Survey of India was placed under the superintendence of Major-General Sir A. Cunningham of the Royal Engineers. One of the most valuable works upon Scottish antiquities that has been published in recent years[3] is by another officer of the same corps, Captain T. P. White of the Ordnance Survey. His two portly volumes, the result of three years' field observation in a portion of one county, are evidence of what would be forthcoming by a systematic and thorough archaeological exploration of the whole country. His material was collected when he was engaged in Argyllshire as Superintending Officer, but was not required for the purposes of the

---

[1] *Bulletin*, i., pp. 88, 103, and elsewhere.

[2] The material thus collected is handed over to MM. E. Babelon, R. Cagnat, and S. Reinach, three members of the Commission on North Africa, who supplement it from the reports of the agents of the Department of Public Instruction, the narratives of travellers, and other sources, ancient and modern. (See *Matériaux*, xxi. (1887), pp. 171-204.)

The topographical sheets are taken for the archaeological charts just as they are, and consequently show all existing roads, railways, and canals, bridges, vineyards, and the like, and present boundaries. The only archaeological information delineated on the sheets are Roman roads, which are shown by broken lines. All other objects and ruins surveyed by the engineers are marked with running numbers in red, accompanied by the ancient name of the place if it is known. When the Commission have special information regarding any object, it is given in the descriptive text which accompanies each sheet under the running number of the object. The text is thus the archaeological index for reading the map.

The manifest objection to this plan is that the map itself tells nothing, but is merely a finger-post to point to an archaeological catalogue. The advantage is that it saves the expense of redrawing the topographical sheets and engraving them in a new form.

The scale of the maps is that adopted for the survey of Algeria, $\frac{1}{50000}$ (or 1.267 inches to a mile, *i.e.* our Ordnance Survey's smallest scale), and is figured in kilometres on the inner margin of each sheet.

[3] *Archaeological Sketches in Scotland*, folio, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1873-75).

ations given or corrections made by the field workers where required, or, if necessary, a supplementary survey made.

Since the Ordnance Survey of Scotland was completed, attention has been directed to the value of Place names. The survey is not altogether satisfactory in this matter. Some of the names entered are wrong, and others are doubtful. Often the most characteristic names are the Field names. These are not recorded at all, but should certainly be obtained for the archaeological survey. The Gaelic names on the Ordnance Survey are, in many instances, not in accordance with local pronunciation, and several varieties of spelling seem to have been adopted. In an Archaeological survey care should be taken to obtain the exact local pronunciation from the most trustworthy sources, and wherever possible the local spelling. The phonograph might be turned to excellent service in this matter. The local pronunciation could by this means be accurately obtained, labelled, and put away. Local dialects prevail in every part of the country, and a scientific attempt should be made to record them. A phonological museum would be of great interest, and would probably prove of advantage to students of philology. Apart from the general question, we would thus obtain reliable information as to Place names; and instead of having to rely upon the ear of one observer, we would have a phonogram that could be made to speak to any one and at any time, and to tell its own story.

After the survey has been made, the information will be transferred to the sheets of the existing topographical survey, both on the six-inch scale for accuracy and the one-inch scale for convenience; showing on the sheets the monuments surveyed, and distinguishing the several classes by different symbols, and the various epochs by different colours.[1] How

---

[1] In Leroy's *Carte Archéologique du Département de la Seine Inférieure*, 1859, four colours are used to distinguish different epochs, Gaulish, Roman, Frankish, and Modern; and conventional signs for the different classes of monuments. Conventional signs are also used on the Archaeological Map of France of 1869 (*supra*, p. 22). Mr. A. C. Smith uses six colours on his map of North Wiltshire. Mr. Payne and Sir John Evans distinguish by colour between Roman and Pre-Roman. M. Cazalis de Fondouce proposes six colours: yellow for the Palaeolithic age; blue for the Neolithic; green for the Bronze age (the

much of the detail of the present aspect of the country, as delineated on the topographical survey, should be retained on the archaeological charts is a question for consideration. Enough must in any case be given to identify the situation of the objects; but modern towns and streets, railways, canals, and the like should be indicated by light shading, so as not to distract the attention or weary the eye. They should appear simply as a haze upon the surface, the body of the map representing the physical features and the ancient monuments. It is essential that the contour and geographical features of the country be shown on archaeological maps, as

---

colour being suggested by the patination of bronze objects), red for the Iron age; and shades of red for the epochs of that age—brownish red for the period of the Iron age anterior to the Roman epoch; vermilion for the Roman epoch, and carmine for the post-Roman periods. *Matériaux pour l'Histoire primitive de l'Homme*, xi., p. 292.

The first attempt to invent a set of international symbols was made by the Archaeological Section of the Scientific Association of Cracow, in the appointment of a commission for this object, with Count A. Przezdziecki as its president. Their report was presented to the Bologna Congress of Prehistoric Archaeology and Anthropology in 1871 (*Bologna Congress*, p. 364). At that Congress a committee was appointed to examine and report upon this paper. The committee held a meeting in Stockholm in 1874, when the question was fully discussed, and a sub-committee appointed to consider the details of the scheme. The sub-committee drew up a very interesting and instructive report, which is printed as a supplement to *Matériaux pour l'Histoire primitive et naturelle de l'Homme* (vol. x., 1875), translated into English by Professor Otis T. Mason of Columbian University, in *Report of the Smithsonian Institution*, 1875, p. 221, and also published separately. The report is abridged and described by Sir John Evans, *Journal of the Anthropological Institute* (1876), v., p. 427. See also *Matériaux*, viii., p. 353; ix., p. 316; xi., pp. 291, 476; xiii., pp. 314, 421; xxi., pp. 170, 172, 190.

The International Code was used in De Vesly's *Carte préhistorique de la Seine-Inférieure* of 1877 (reviewed in *Matériaux*, xiii. (1878), pp. 89, 320); in Dalcan's *Carte préhistorique de la Gironde* of 1878, and in Moreau's *Carte préhistorique du Département de la Mayenne*, 1878, but neither of the latter has apparently been published.

A series of symbols has been devised by the Standing Committee of the Congress of Archaeological Societies for the preparation of archaeological maps for the diagrammatic representation of antiquarian objects and sites. *Nature*, 1893, p. 272. Mr. J. Romilly Allen suggests another code for his proposed archaeological survey of Wales. *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, x., 5th sec., p. 56.

In the Archaeological Atlas of Tunis conventional symbols are used to mark various objects, *e.g.* cemeteries and churches, which are varied according to circumstances; the symbol for a cemetery so as to distinguish whether it is Christian, Mussulman, or Jewish, and that for a church to show whether it is a church, a chapel, or a mosque.

these are often valuable elements in judging of the use and even of the age of particular objects, and for explaining difficulties. Thus the occupation of elevated sites may be explained by the fact that the low-lying lands were formerly thicket or marsh;[1] and on what is now dry land we may find the remains of a lake dwelling. The physical condition of the country determined its occupation, just as it caused trade to flow in certain channels.[2] The presence of a peat moss or of a raised beach or other feature may materially aid in ascertaining the age or determining the object of a prehistoric monument. The want of water in many ancient camps has often been remarked upon. The state of the country in old times may show that this was probably not the case when a particular camp was occupied. The absence of antiquities may in some cases be accounted for by the area being forest land in early times. In dealing with the Downs of North Wiltshire, Mr. A. C. Smith thought it desirable to show on his archaeological map the existing Sarsen stones, as these are a material factor in the problems connected with the monuments of the district.

As far as possible, therefore, the geology of the recent period should be transferred from the geological to the archaeological survey.[3] The sheet of the Geological Survey of Glasgow, on the six-inch scale, is better for archaeological purposes than the corresponding topographical sheet. When we see the land falling from the upper parts of the city to an alluvial tract along the Clyde, we understand how it was that the original occupation was on the ridge of the Rattonraw, and that the Stockwell was at first occupied by salmon fishers, and the Saltmarket by fullers and their tubs. While this is so, the map is so crowded with geological information as to

---

[1] Smith, *Guide to the British and Roman Antiquities of the North Wiltshire Downs*, p. 43.

[2] *E.g.* The Weald of Kent. *Archaeologia*, li., p. 449.

[3] Ossowski insists on the necessity of making the geology of the quaternary period the basis of an archaeological survey, at least in such a country as Western Prussia. *Carte archéologique de la Prusse occidentale*, pp. 13, 21. See also Nicolas, "Études préhistoriques sur la basse vallée du Rhône" in *Congrès archéologique de France*, XLIIIe session (Arles, 1876), p. 501.

the older formations, and so obscured by the features of the present city, that it is not practically serviceable for the archaeologist. A few of the spots where ancient canoes have been dug up are indicated; but if the whole of these, and the sites of other ancient remains, were accurately laid down on a fresh map, with the depths at which they were found, and if the river was shown in its original instead of its artificial condition, with its depth of water and its fords and pools, we would have some reliable archaeological material for settling the vexed question of the geology of the valleys of the Clyde and the Kelvin. Geology and archaeology are indeed the complements of each other.[1] If a question arises as to the age of, say, a find of flint implements, the geologist will deal with the evidence of situation, the archaeologist with that of form.

Passing to more recent times, the former boundaries of towns and parishes and the boundaries of parishes now absorbed in others should be given, as also other divisional areas now disused; as for instance, in Scotland, the boundaries of bishoprics, deaneries, and the like, as these throw considerable light on the ancient occupation of the country.

Along with the sheets of the archaeological survey of each district there would be issued a relative memoir containing a concise description of each object and exact details of its size, position, and the like, and a scale-plan or section in the case of the more important, and, where necessary, a photograph and measured drawing. An archaeological index something similar to the one which accompanies Ossowski's Archaeological Map of West Prussia[2] should be added, which would ultimately form the basis for an

---

[1] Le Comte de Maricourt, in explaining his prehistoric map of part of the arrondissement of Senlis, department of Oise, divides the prehistoric period into two epochs—geological time and modern time. *Congrès archéologique de France*, XLIVe session (1877), p. 23.

Sadowski, *Die Handelsstrassen der Griechen und Römer*, deals in chap. I. with the Physiography of the country between the Oder, Vistula, Dnieper, and Niemen (Jena, 1877, 8vo). See also the remarks of Flörschutz in his paper on the relation between Geology and Archaeology in *Annalen des Vereins für Nassauische Altertumskunde*, XXV. (1893), p. 1.

[2] An index, similar in plan, accompanies Mr. Payne's Archaeological Map of Kent and Sir John Evan's Map of Hertfordshire, but less comprehensive and thorough.

archaeological dictionary of the United Kingdom. The original survey books and other material would remain in the Public Record Office, or some other repository, for reference when required.

Such exactness in description may appear to be pedantic, but it is essential. Precise observation and accurate description are the foundation of all progress in archaeology, and one object of a general official survey is to secure a correct and impartial record of facts and so to provide the means for checking existing descriptions, and as a consequence the theories founded upon them, and for affording a more sure footing for future reasoning. Another object is to have as full and particular a description as it is possible to make, so that every one may be in the position of an observer, and that we may be able to reproduce the monument if the original be destroyed.[1]

The published accounts of even the more prominent and best known objects often differ widely,[2] and no one is prepared to accept the measurements of his predecessors if he has an opportunity of checking them himself. The necessary details and thoroughly reliable descriptions will only be obtained by a general survey made by an official surveyor, competent to observe and record, and with no theory to support or evolve. Even with the best intentions, persons whose business is not that of surveying omit the most obvious particulars. Dr. Joseph Anderson mentions that Cairn Greg, in the parish of Monifieth, in Forfarshire, was opened in 1834 by Mr. Erskine of Linlathen, in presence of the late Lord Rutherfurd and Mr. George Dundas, advocate, and re-opened in 1864 by the late Dr. John Stuart and a number of other antiquaries; and yet neither Dr. Stuart, who wrote two separate accounts of the second examination, nor any of those who took part in either examination of the cairn, gives the slightest hint of its size. The only information to be found on the

---

[1] See J. Romilly Allen in *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, vii., 5th S. (1890), p. 278.

[2] Mr. Burgess, Archaeological Surveyor for Western and Southern India, refers to the difficulty he had in obtaining exact information from the various local persons employed to fill up schedules of preliminary information respecting the archaeological objects in their districts. Two returns often gave totally different measurements of the same object. Burgess, *Lists of the Antiquarian Remains in the Bombay Presidency* (Bombay, 1865, 4to).

point is in "The New Statistical Account of Forfarshire," where it is described as "a large heap of stones."[1]

There is a recognized method in every art which long experience has proved to be the best. Every land surveyor will give substantially the same account of an estate, will record the same particulars and in the same order, but hardly two archaeologists will give the same account of a hill-fort; the points taken up will be different, and the order of recording them different. From this cause, detailed accounts by competent observers often lose much of their value, as they cannot be co-related. Many drawings are worthless for want of a scale, and many plans drawn to scale are defective for want of a section. The plans and drawings of different observers are drawn to different scales, so that comparison is always difficult, and in many cases impossible.[2] Very often, too, they have been made to illustrate a particular point, not to record the facts of the monument itself. One of the advantages to be derived from an official survey would be that it would describe each monument exactly as it stands; the drawings of each class of monuments would be on the same scale, and plans and sections would be made according to a uniform rule.

Few travellers and field workers seem to have learned the use of the note book. Instead of making their description on the spot, they are too apt to take a few rough jottings and record them in their journal in the evening, or, it may be, after the lapse of a week or of a month. This leads to much inaccuracy, and figures are altered to reconcile discrepancies which would have been discovered and properly rectified if the description had been written at the time.[3] Time, too, is generally against the non-professional observer. He is unable to note everything, and we constantly

---

[1] Anderson, *Scotland in Pagan Times—Bronze and Stone Ages*, p. 10.

[2] Very erroneous conclusions are sometimes drawn by comparing drawings on different scales. See, for example, a case mentioned by Sir John Evans, *Ancient Stone Implements*, p. 569.

[3] Dr. Johnson remarked, "How seldom descriptions correspond with realities; and the reason is, that the people do not write them till some time after, and their imagination has added circumstances." Boswell, *The Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*, p. 133 (London, 1785, 1st ed.).

find a subsequent visitor remarking on something which has been omitted. He himself records that item of information, but disregards something else, so that it is but seldom that we have a complete record of the details of any monument. The official observer has no such difficulty. His duty is to record certain particulars in every case, and he cannot pass on to another piece of work until the first is finished.

What is material or immaterial is at present difficult to determine, and therefore everything should be set down. Taking a plain unsculptured standing stone as the simplest example, we should have information of (1) its elevation above ordnance datum, its situation and surroundings; (2) its relation to other adjacent monuments if any; (3) the kind of stone, granite, sandstone, slate, or schist, and so on; (4) its characteristics, whether it is the rock of the district or brought from a distance, and if so whence, if it can be determined; whether a boulder or quarried, whether entirely rough, or wrought, or partly wrought; if a stratified rock, whether the faces are those of the stratification; (5) its shape and dimensions; (6) whether erect or inclined, and if inclined, at what angle and in what direction; (7) its position by latitude and longitude, and the true bearing of its principal face; (8) whatever in its appearance or situation may indicate the period when it was erected. In every case care should be taken to ascertain, if possible, whether there has been any alteration in the natural features of the spot or in the position of the object itself, *e.g.* whether there has been a change of level in the land, alteration of a water course, destruction or growth of a forest, and so on; whether the stone is in its original position or has been moved.[1] In the case of a circle or cromlech, the shape, dimensions, characteristics, and true position of every stone should be given. Whether a stone be rough or dressed may indicate whether it originally belonged to the circle or not.[2] Apparent mistakes may be of importance. The absence of a stone or stones in a circle, for

[1] Barochan Cross, Renfrewshire, for example, does not now stand in its original position, but on a spot to which it was removed last century.

[2] The importance of accuracy in minute details will not be disputed. On the subject of stone circles reference may be made to *P.S.A.*, 2nd S., x., pp. 302, 305, 306; cf. ix., pp. 141, 145, 148.

instance, is to be noted, and the position of the blank ascertained, as it has been conjectured that the incompleteness of the great circles of Avebury, Stonehenge, Callernish, and others is intentional, and that it is like the imperfection of the circles and the ducts on cup-marked rocks.[1] So, too, earthworks should be accurately and minutely described, their areas calculated in every case, and an effort made to ascertain the geometrical relations which subsist between their parts.[2] If possible a section should be made and the character of the structure ascertained. A section of the Antonine wall proves conclusively the accuracy of its description by Julius Capitolinus as a *murus cespeticius*, a turf or feal dyke.[3] Canon Greenwell, from the nature of the material used in the formation of the barrows he examined, was able to judge of the appliances which the people who made them used and their plan of working.[4] It may be a question whether a mound is artificial or natural. When it might be either and no examination has been made, this must be noted and the entry marked as provisional. When a barrow or other monument is known to have been opened, this should be shown on the survey.

The exact orientation of every church should be ascertained.[5] Early churches were oriented to the sun, so that the light fell on the altar through the eastern door at sunrise.[6] When the practice of dedicating

---

[1] Greenwell, *British Barrows*, p. 7; cf. *P.S.A.Scot.*, xxix., p. 71.

[2] The ancient earthworks in the Mississippi Valley have been evidently constructed to scale and with the most striking exactness. Wilson, *Prehistoric Man*, i., p. 271 (London, 1876).

[3] "Antoninus Pius," in the *Historiae Augustae Scriptores*, i., p. 258 (Lugd. Bat. 1671); *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, p. 65. "It is of turf upon a stone foundation, and is about four yards thick." Pinkerton, *An Enquiry into the History of Scotland preceding the reign of Malcolm III., or the year* 1056, i., p. 55.

[4] *British Barrows*, p. 5.

[5] See *Instructions de la Commission archéologique diocésaine à Poitiers*, p. 43 (Poitiers, 1851, 8vo). The Ecclesiological Society (originally the Cambridge Camden Society) prepared an Orientator for the use of its members, along with a catalogue of Saint's days.

[6] Lockyer, *Dawn of Astronomy*, p. 96; *P.S.A.*, 2nd S., xiii., p. 341. *The Athenaeum*, 5th October, 1895, p. 458. Scott, *Essay on the History of English Church Architecture*, p. 14 (London, 1881, 4to).

Durandus, *Rationale divinorum officiorum*, i., 1, § 8, says that a church is to be

churches to certain Saints was introduced, it became the rule in England, in theory at least, that the church should have its axis pointed to the rising of the sun on the Saint's day.[1] So also the true position of pillar stones, especially when they constitute a circle, should be noted, as various theories have been founded upon assumed bearings of certain stones. If it turns out that any monument has been oriented to sunrise or to a particular star, this may help to guide us to its age.

Apart from the advantages to be gained by exactitude in measurements, in correcting and establishing the present conclusions of archaeological science, it will be a material aid in making further advance. For example, a reliable register of dimensions may assist in enabling us to ascertain the unit of measurement adopted by the builders of monuments. Further, if we find one unit in use in one set of monuments and another unit in another set, presumably the builders were different, and, it may be, of widely separated ages, although there is nothing in their external appearance to indicate this. Accurate measurements, again, of buildings of historic times may afford evidence of the date when a particular unit was in use.

In passing, it may be suggested that all the objects of prehistoric times in our museums should be carefully measured and weighed. The people who produced the beautiful tools and weapons of the neolithic

---

founded so that its head may point due east, that is, to sunrise at the equinoxes and not at the solstices. In the most ancient temples of pagan Rome the statue of the god placed on the altar looked to the west, so that the worshipper who prayed or worshipped looked to the east. The façade was therefore to the west, and this explains the statement of Hyginus, Frontinus, and Vitruvius, that the primitive temples of Rome were oriented to the west. Greek temples, on the other hand, were oriented to the east, that is, the façade was to the east and the worshipper prayed towards the west. This practice was adopted by Roman architects, and later Roman temples were built after this fashion. Beaudouin, "*La Limitation des fonds de terre dans ses rapports avec le droit de propriété*" in *Nouvelle Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 1893, p. 416 (Reprinted, Paris, 1894, 8vo). Isidore, *Etymologiae*, xv., 4, § 7, says that in constructing a temple they looked towards sunrise at the equinox, but what he had in view was evidently the practice of the augurs and the agrimensors.

[1] Durandus, *The Symbolism of Churches*, by Neale and Webb, p. 21 (Leeds, 1843, 8vo). Chambers, *Divine Worship in England*, p. 1 (London, 1877, 4to).

period, we may be certain, did not fashion them at random, but according to certain rules of proportion and to some scale, just as hammers at the present day are classed according to weight, and other tools by the width of their cutting edge. A similar inquiry as to the objects of the Bronze and Iron Ages would be equally interesting. The rough flints of the palaeolithic period do not suggest a reference to a standard, but a careful examination of these may show the prevalence of some unit, and who knows but we may thus be able to recover the normal length of the foot and thumb of the drift men and the cave dwellers!

So much for existing monuments, but the places at which portable objects have been found ought, as far as possible, to be indicated on the archaeological maps, the different classes of "finds" being distinguished by appropriate symbols.[1] The depths at which they occurred, and the height of the spot above or its distance below Ordnance datum, should be shown, as also the character of the containing stratum—sand, gravel, clay, loam, or the like—and of the overlying strata, just as the depths of mines and bores with intervening strata and their characteristic fossils are shown on the geological sheets.[2]

The sites of monuments which are known to have been removed should be recorded. This should be comparatively easy when a description and particulars of the monument exist. It would be otherwise when there is no written description to refer to, and the inquiry would in that case require to be conducted with caution and judgment. If the surveying officer was informed that a tumulus had stood on an indicated spot, had been opened and certain articles removed, and the tumulus itself thereafter destroyed, it would be his duty to investigate the story and to make a report. Where the occurrence was comparatively recent, the facts would

---

[1] On his Archaeological Map of Kent Mr. Payne notes discoveries of palaeolithic but not of neolithic implements. He likewise records finds of British coins and hoards of Roman coins, but not of individual examples of the latter. *Archaeologia*, li., p. 447. Sir John Evans follows the same rule as regards Hertfordshire. *Ib.*, liii., p. 246.

[2] As showing the value of details in such matters, reference may be made to the case of the recent alleged discovery in the palaeolithic gravels of Kent of human remains of the palaeolithic age. *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society*, li. (1895), p. 505.

probably be ascertained. If a cairn has been swept away, he might be able to ascertain its shape and dimensions, whether it had been chambered or without chambers. If urns or other objects had been removed, information might be obtainable as to their colour and shape, and whether any, and if so, what articles had been found with them. Where any of the objects had been preserved, the officer would inspect and describe, and note in whose custody they were.

In France the spots where finds have been made are reported to the *Commission de Géographie historique*, with the evidence in support of the statement. This is investigated by the Commission, and if found to be satisfactory the spot is marked on the map in accordance with the nature of the find.

Another end to be attained by an archaeological survey is to distinguish the true from the false. Objects are often regarded locally as ancient monuments which are not so. Many of the standing stones noted on the Ordnance Survey are, I suspect, dropped boulders, and the eye is easily deceived by imaginary camps and serpent mounds. The Kaim of Kinprunes repeats itself, notwithstanding the sad and sorrowful example of Jonathan Oldbuck. It would be the duty of the archaeological survey officers to examine all objects which have been described or treated as ancient monuments, and, where necessary, mark them as false or as doubtful.

THE PROTECTION OF OUR MONUMENTS.

Of not less importance than a survey of the monuments of antiquity is their protection and preservation. This at present stands on a very unsatisfactory footing. Monuments as *partes soli* belong to the owner of the land, and he can do with them as he chooses. It is trespass to cross a field to look at a cairn or a ruined peel, and the proprietor can enforce the law if he thinks fit.[1] On the other hand, it is not a crime to deface

[1] An object, however interesting it may be scientifically, is not in law a public place, and no amount of walking to it by students or other members of the public will ever entitle them to do so as of right. They can only go on sufferance. The case arose some years ago in reference to the well-known Rock and Spindle near St. Andrews.

or injure an ancient monument[1] unless the charge can be brought up to malicious mischief.[2] If, therefore, a tourist were thoughtlessly to overthrow and break a cross, or to obliterate an inscription, the act would probably stand on the same footing as if he were to upset a rubbing post or tear down a quack doctor's advertisement.[3] To remove a dead body from a grave is a punishable offence; to enter upon another man's property, open a tumulus and carry off a skeleton is not. It subjects a farmer to a fine of £20 or twelve months' imprisonment if he uses dynamite for catching fish in any water, public or private; but he is perfectly free, so far as the criminal law is concerned, to explode dynamite under a cromlech or to blow up a crannog.[4] It is a criminal offence to sleep in a loft or in a stackyard without the consent of the owner, or without such consent to encamp on or to light a fire near cultivated land;[5] but a gipsy family may occupy an old church on a moor or encamp in a hill-fort without fear of fine or imprisonment.

"As to the Rock and Spindle," says Lord Ardmillan, "I really think there can be very little doubt that, however interesting it may be to visitors and geologists, or however pleasant it may be to saunter along the shore in order to look at it, it is not the kind of use, nor is the place which the people visit the kind of place, which would be known in law as a public place. There is no law to support a right of sauntering, or a right of picnicing, or a right of walking out to look at the Rock and Spindle and walking back again." Duncan *v.* Lees, 13th December, 1870, 9 *Macpherson*, p. 274.

[1] "Nothing exposes a ruin to wanton ill-usage so much as ignorance of its history, except, indeed, in the case of those who ought to know better, and who, if not deterred by authority, remove or chip off parts of a monument because it possesses historical or artistic traditions." Cole, *First Report of the Curator of Ancient Monuments in India*, p. 35 (Simla, 1882, 8vo).

[2] A statement of the law applicable to injuries to monuments in the United Kingdom and in France and Germany is given in Appendix B.

[3] About 1853 or 1854 Mr. Baillie of Dochfour took civil proceedings in court against a farmer who had removed some stones from one of the Towers at Glenelg (p. 48) for dyke building, and had him compelled to replace them.

[4] 40 and 41 Vict., c. 65 (1877). This Act extends to the United Kingdom as regards public waters, including the sea. By 41 and 42 Vict., c. 39, § 12, it is extended to private waters, but in England only.

[5] The Trespass (Scotland) Act, 1865, 28 and 29 Vict., c. 56.

THE ANCIENT MONUMENTS PROTECTION ACT.

After long and persevering labour, Sir John Lubbock succeeded in 1882 in passing the Ancient Monuments Protection Act (45 and 46 Vict., c. 73); and somewhat earlier the late Mr. A. H. Rhind induced the Treasury to furbish up, and arm the authorities with, that ancient blunderbuss, the law of treasure trove.

The Ancient Monuments Protection Act is a definite piece of legislation, and is valuable so far as it goes.[1] It is, however, limited in its operation to 69 monuments in Great Britain and Ireland (29 in England, 21 in Scotland, and 19 in Ireland) specified in a schedule, and to such other similar monuments as may from time to time be brought under it. The owner of any of the scheduled monuments may by deed constitute the Commissioners of Works the guardians of such monument, and in that case they are bound to maintain it out of such moneys as the Treasury may provide.[2] Any one may likewise, by deed or will, give or bequeath to the Commissioners of Works the estate or interest he has in any ancient monument, and the Commissioners may accept such gift or bequest if they think it expedient.

The Scottish list includes the Catstane, Ring of Brogar, the Stones of Callernish, the Towers of Glenelg, the Dun of Dornadilla, and others of a like character.

The Treasury are authorized to appoint an Inspector of Ancient Monuments, an office which is admirably filled by General Pitt-Rivers, The Commissioners have power, with consent of the Treasury, to purchase any ancient monument, and for this purpose the Lands Clauses Acts are incorporated with the Act; but, so far as I am aware, the power has never been exercised.

The Act constitutes it a punishable offence to injure or deface any of

---

[1] It is framed very much on the lines of the Public Monuments Act of 1854, 17 and 18 Vict., c. 33. See Appendix B.

[2] The guardianship thus constituted is, however, not binding upon a succeeding owner, unless (*a*) he derives his title from the owner who has granted the guardianship deed, or (*b*) he is a liferenter or heir of entail in possession, or (*c*) he has a power of sale.

the scheduled monuments or any similar monuments of which the Commissioners may consent to become guardians, and makes provision for the prosecution of offenders.

In Ireland, which as a rule has far more attention from Government than either England or Scotland, a large number of ancient buildings are under the charge of the public authorities in virtue of the provisions of the Irish Church Act of 1869 (32 and 33 Vict., c. 42). Section 25 of that Act provided that such ecclesiastical buildings as were no longer in use, and which the Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners considered to be deserving of being maintained as national monuments, should be transferred to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland. By Order dated 30th October, 1880, there were accordingly vested in the Commissioners of Works 137 structures, and £50,000 for their preservation and maintenance. Extensive repairs have been effected upon most of these buildings, under the superintendence of an architect appointed by the Board, and they are now, as far as may be, in good order. They are periodically reported on, and the reports—in some cases accompanied by interesting plans and drawings—are annually laid before Parliament.

Under section 10 of the Act of 1882, Her Majesty may, by Order in Council, make additions to the list of monuments protected by the Act. This power has, however, been taken advantage of only to a very limited extent. It has been exercised on six occasions between 1887 and 1892, and 31 monuments—7 in England, 17 in Scotland, and 7 in Ireland—have been brought under the Act. The Government have, in fact, rendered the Act inoperative, as regards the future, by steadily declining to accept further monuments even when offered to them.

Ireland has again been more fortunate. The Act of 1892 (55 and 56 Vict., c. 46) authorizes the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland to accept the guardianship of ancient monuments generally, and to apply the surplus income of the fund vested in them under the Act of 1869 towards their maintenance. A considerable number of buildings—castles, round towers, and abbeys—have already been transferred under this Act, and a number of others are awaiting the completion of vesting orders.

There are thus between 178 and 180 monuments in Ireland under public protection, as against 38 in Scotland and 36 in England.

THE PROTECTION OF MONUMENTS IN OTHER COUNTRIES.

The protection of ancient monuments has long been a matter of public concern in France, but was put upon its present footing about sixty years ago. In 1834 the *Comité des Travaux historiques* was established by royal decree on the recommendation of Guizot, then Minister of Public Instruction.[1] Its function was to collect and publish all the important unpublished material for the history of France. Next year Guizot nominated a second committee under the Ministry of Public Instruction to take charge of the unpublished monuments of science and art as related to the history of France. This committee was composed of eminent men skilled in the subjects it had to deal with, and was divided into two sections—the one occupied with the sciences, the other with the arts. Guizot was unable to complete his scheme during his term of office, but his successor, M. de Salvandy, Minister of Public Instruction, in 1837 converted the sub-committee on arts into a committee of arts and monuments, practically a sub-committee on Archaeology. This sub-committee was, in fact, the suggestion of M. Vitet, then Inspector-General of Historic Monuments. The constitution of the committee has been somewhat modified in later years, and Archaeology has been made a distinct section with a special committee, the *Commission des Monuments historiques.* It consists of ten *ex-officio* members, and such others as the Minister of Public Instruction may nominate.[2] It is an expert committee of advice, which communicates on the one hand with localities and with public bodies, local societies and

---

[1] The *Annuaire des Sociétés savantes* and the *Revue des Sociétés savantes* record the labours of the committee and everything that is of interest to archaeologists; while the great work of De Lasteyrie and Pontalis, in course of publication, *Bibliographie générale des Travaux historiques et archéologiques* (Paris, 1888-93, 4to), brings together the titles of all papers published by the Archaeological Societies of France.

[2] Its official publication is the *Bulletin archéologique*, which began in 1843, and has continued till now, with some variation from time to time in its title. In 1883 Archaeology became a separate section of the *Comité.*

individual antiquaries, and on the other hand with the Minister of Public Instruction. It prepares and revises a list of monuments having an historic or artistic interest, sees that they are not interfered with, makes suggestions for their protection or maintenance, reports on injuries and on all proposed restorations. A considerable sum of public money is annually appropriated to the maintenance, repair, and acquisition of ancient monuments, and the Commission advises the Minister of Public Instruction as to its distribution.[1]

The existing law providing for the protection of ancient monuments is that of 30th March, 1887,[2] which is something similar to our Act of 1882, but is much more thorough and comprehensive. It applies both to immoveables and moveables—the equivalent of our Scottish heritable moveable. Immoveables, either so by their nature or by destination, may be classed by the Minister of Public Instruction, in whole or in part, as historic monuments, in cases where their preservation is of national interest from an historic or artistic point of view. Before a monument can be classed, the consent of the proprietor must, however, be obtained. This cannot be dispensed with when the monument belongs to a private person, and the classification may be made subject to specified conditions. Where the owner is the State, a department, a commune, a vestry, or other public body, classification may be made without consent, by means of an order of public administration. The Minister can also enforce the law of expropriation for public utility, of 3rd May, 1841, as regards monuments which have been classed; in other words, he can acquire them by compulsory purchase, a procedure similar to that of our Lands Clauses Acts.[3] When a private owner has declined to allow a monument to

---

[1] In 1856-65 plans and descriptions of many of the buildings repaired and taken care of by the Department of Public Instruction were published at Paris in folio.

[2] *Loi et Décrets relatifs à la conservation des Monuments historiques* (Paris, 1889, 8vo); also in Rivière, *Lois usuelles*, p. 1344 (Paris, 1888, 6th ed.).

[3] Thus, in 1887, the Minister of Public Instruction, M. Spuller, addressed a special report to the President of the Republic on behalf of the Commission on Megalithic Monuments, and prayed for a decree declaring the preservation of the megalithic monuments of the Commune of Carnac to be of public advantage. On 21st September of that year a decree of

be classed, the Minister can likewise acquire it compulsorily for the State.

The effect of classification is, that the monument cannot be destroyed, or be restored, repaired, or altered to any extent without the concurrence of the Department of Public Instruction. It cannot be acquired by compulsory sale by any other department, public body, or corporation until notice has been given to the Minister of Public Instruction and his report has been received. The list of monuments which had been classed up to the year 1889 fills forty-one large octavo pages, and three more are applicable to Algiers.[1]

When, in the course of any excavation in land belonging to the State, to a department, a commune, a vestry, or other public establishment, any one discovers any monument, ruin, inscription, or object of archaeological, historic, or artistic interest, the Mayor of the Commune must at once take measures for its provisional protection, and must advise the Prefect of the Department. The Prefect reports to the Minister of Public Instruction, who gives final orders on the subject. If the find occurs on private property, the Mayor advises the Prefect. On a report from the Prefect, and after consultation with the Commission on Historic Monuments, the Minister of Public Instruction may acquire the site, in whole or in part, by compulsory purchase.

The law as regards moveable objects of historic or artistic value is similar to that respecting immoveables, but it does not extend to objects belonging to private persons. A list of the objects classed under this branch of the law is exhibited at the prefecture of each Department, so that the public may be aware of them. When classed an object cannot be sold, and a sale made in violation of the law is void.

---

expropriation was signed, and was published in the *Journal Officiel* (the equivalent of our Gazette) expropriating the alignments of Grand-Menec, and Kermario and various tumuli, menhirs, and dolmens.

H. Nicolas has an article on the acquisition by the State of the megalithic monuments in the department of Vaucluse and neighbourhood in *Mémoires de l'Académie de Vaucluse*, xiii. (1893), p. 232.

[1] Annexed to the special edition of the *Loi*, *supra*, p. 52, note. The list is officially given in the *Journal Officiel*, 31 March, 1887.

Apart from the central government, the local governments take an active interest in the ancient monuments in the Department, and in many cases give grants of money for their protection or repair. In the Department of Seine-Inférieure, for instance, there is an administrative commission,[1] created in 1818, for the archaeological and monumental service of the Department. The Prefect is *ex officio* president. In 1867 it began to publish a bulletin[2] of its proceedings, and the Ministry of Public Instruction gives it an annual grant to assist in meeting the expense of this publication. In many other Departments there are similar commissions.[3]

In 1834 De Caumont established at Caen the *Société Française pour la conservation et description des Monuments historiques.* It holds an annual congress at some town of importance from an archaeological point of view, and has in various ways materially aided in the preservation of ancient monuments.[4]

In 1879 a separate Commission on Megalithic Monuments was appointed by the Government, with M. Henri Martin as president.[5] It drew up an inventory of menhirs, dolmens, and the like, and is charged with the

---

[1] *Commission départementale des Antiquités de la Seine-Inférieure.* See *Bulletin*, i. (1868), Preface; and iii. (1874), Preface.

[2] The *Procès-verbaux* (1816-66) were published in two volumes (Rouen, 1864-67, 8vo). The first volume of the *Bulletin* appeared in 1868, and has been continued since then.

[3] *E.g.*, *Commission historique du Département du Nord*, with its head-quarters at Lille; *Commission des Monuments et Documents historiques de la Gironde* in Bordeaux; and there are similar commissions for the Somme, Côte-d'Or, Charente, Seine-et-Marne, Lorraine, Picardy, and for Aix, Avranches, Narbonne, and others.

[4] See *The Gentleman's Magazine*, xi. N.S. (1839), p. 83.

The society publishes the well-known *Bulletin monumental*, which has appeared regularly from 1834 down to the present time.

Caen is also the seat of the energetic *Société des Antiquaries de la Normandie*, whose *Mémoires* have been published annually since 1824.

[5] *Arrêté* of 21st November, 1879. It is a Sub-Commission of the *Commission des Monuments historiques.* The present president is M. G. De Mortillet. This Commission has for the last two years been engaged in preparing an exhibit for the Paris Exhibition of 1900, to consist of maps, lists of monuments, and the like, *L'Anthropologie* v. (1894), p. 738.

preservation of megalithic monuments and with the duty of advising as to their acquisition by the State.[1]

Belgium has a Royal Commission on Art and Archaeology charged with the care and supervision of her ancient monuments, which proceeds much on the same lines as the French Commission.[2]

The Austrian Empire has a Central Commission for the discovery and preservation of ancient monuments, established in 1850, reconstituted and placed under the Minister for Public Worship and Instruction in 1873. It is divided into three sections, the first of which deals with objects of prehistoric times and ancient art; the second with architectural objects, paintings, drawings, and sculptures—ecclesiastical and secular—of the Middle Ages and recent times down to the end of the eighteenth century. To the third is entrusted the care of historical monuments from the most ancient times to the end of the eighteenth century. The Commission has a yearly grant for carrying on its work, and publishes an annual *Jahrbuch*.[3]

In Prussia and in most of the German States there is a similar Commission. Russia has had one since 1859. In fact, almost every country in Europe, except our own, has some Authority whose duty it is to care for and protect its ancient monuments.[4]

Under the Civil Law certain things were withdrawn from the exercise of ownership, and in this way became inalienable, and were protected against injury. Amongst these were *res divini juris*, which embraced *res sacrae*, *res religiosae*, and *res sanctae*. A burial-ground, for instance, was a *locus religiosus*. It could not be alienated, and if the land on which it was situated was sold, it did not pass to the buyer. To obliterate an

---

[1] See *supra*, p. 53, note 1.

[2] It was established in 1835, and has published since 1862, under the authority of the Minister of the Interior, an annual *Bulletin*.

[3] *Jahrbuch*, i., p. 3 *sqq*. (Wien, 1856, 4to): Wussow, *Die Erhaltung der Denkmäler in den Kulturstaaten der Gegenwart*, i., p. 192; ii., p. 293 (Berlin, 1884-5, 8vo, 2 vols.).

[4] Wussow, *Op. laud.* passim. As to Denmark, see Worsaae, *The Preservation of Antiquities and National Monuments in Denmark*, translated into English, *Report of the Smithsonian Institution for* 1879, p. 299; *P.S.A.*, 2nd S., viii., 57; *P.S.A.Scot.*, xiv., p. 348.

inscription, to throw down a statue, remove a stone or a column from a monument constituted the *crimen sepulcri violati*, which was punishable in some cases by a fine of ten pounds of gold, and in others by condemnation to the mines.[1]

FINDS; TREASURE TROVE.

According to the Civil Law, treasure that one found in his own land belonged to himself. If a person without express search, but by chance, found a treasure in land belonging to another, one half belonged to the finder, and the other half to the owner of the land. This rule, and indeed the whole principle of acquisition of treasure by occupancy (*occupatio*),[2] has been considerably modified in most European countries.

Treasure trove[3] (*thesaurus inventus*), by the law both of England and Scotland, falls within the Royal prerogative as part of the *regalia minora*. This provision is essentially a revenue law, and in former times, when there was much domestic insecurity, was a valuable source of the Crown's casual revenue.[4] According to Blackstone,[5] treasure trove is where any money

---

[1] Julii Paulli, *Sententiae*, i. 21, 8; *Cod.*, 9, 19, 1-5; *Dig.*, 47, 12.

[2] Apart from "treasure" and the rules introduced by Police Acts, the law is that the finder of lost money or of any portable article has a good claim to it against all the world except the true owner. Armory *v.* Delamirie, 1 *Strange*, 505; 1 Smith, *L.C.* p. 343 (10th edition, 1896). See also an interesting American case, Sovern *v.* Yoran (1888), 8 *American State Reports*, 293.

[3] As to treasure trove, see Rhind, *The Law of Treasure Trove, How can it be best adapted to accomplish useful results* (Edinburgh, 1858, 8vo); Article, *On Treasure Trove*, by George Vere Irving, *Journal Brit. Archaeol. Association*, xv., p. 81; *Notes on Treasure Trove* by Robert Temple, Chief Justice of Honduras, *ib.*, p. 100; Article, *Treasure Trove*, by T. H. Baylis, Q.C., in the *Archaeological Journal*, xliii., p. 341; and another by Professor E. C. Clark, *ib.*, p. 350. See also an article by T. G. Faussett, *Archaeological Journal*, xxii., p. 15.

Mr. Rhind originally condemned the law of treasure trove as injurious to the interests of archaeological science; *British Antiquities*, p. 46 (Edinburgh, 1855, 8vo).

The law of treasure trove has its historian, C. A. Beck, *Programma de historia et fatis doctrinae de Thesauris*, Jenae, 1719; and has also a considerable literature duly chronicled in the *Bibliotheca Juridica* of Lipenius (Lipsiae, 1757) and the two Supplements of 1775 and 1789.

[4] Madox, *History and Antiquities of the Exchequer*, i., p. 342 (2nd ed., 1769); Blackstone, *Commentaries*, i., p. 296; Chitty, *Law of the Prerogative of the Crown*, p. 152.

[5] *Commentaries*, i., p. 295.

or coin, gold, silver, plate, or bullion is found hidden *in* the earth or other private place, the owner thereof being unknown. If found *upon* the earth or in the sea, it belongs not to the Crown, but to the finder, if no owner appears. It is the *hiding*, not the abandoning, which gives the Crown the property. The law of Scotland is practically identical with that of England in so far as regards the prerogative of the Crown to "treasure hid in the earth." It is "confiscated as caduciary, whereby the owners are presumed to relinquish or lose the same."[1]

> "Think of the old days when invading bands
> Came like a deluge, swamping men and lands;
> How natural it was that many should
> Hide their best valuables where they could.
> 'Twas so in times of the old Roman sway;
> So yesterday—and so it is to-day;—
> And all lies dead and buried in the soil,
> The soil is Caesar's—his the splendid spoil."[2]

Occultatio thesauri, the fraudulent concealment of treasure trove is not a criminal offence in Scotland.[3] In England it is, and a finder may be indicted for the concealment of treasure trove. Thus, in January, 1863, a ploughman, William Butchers, ploughed up in a field in Sussex some ancient gold vessels and rings, weighing above 11 lbs. Supposing these to be brass, he sold them for 5s. 6d., or at the rate of 6d. per lb., to one Silas Thomas, with a promise from the latter of a better price if he got more. Thomas gave the articles to his brother-in-law, Stephen Willett, who took them to Brown and Wingrove, gold refiners, Cheapside, London,

---

[1] Stair, *Institutions*, 2, 1, 5; 2, 3, 60; 3, 3, 27; Erskine, *Institute*, 2, 1, 12; *Quoniam Attachiamenta*, c. 32, *Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland*, i., p. 652. Rankine, *Law of Land Ownership*, p. 224 (3rd ed., 1891). Fountainhall has a curious and interesting note on "Treasure Trove," 3 *Br. Sup.*, p. 148.

[2] Goethe, *Faustus*, second part, act 1, translated by Anster, p. 16 (London, 1864).

[3] Hume, *Crimes*, i., p. 63 and note. It appears, however, in the *Regiam Majestatem*, i. 1 and iv. 3, following Glanvil, i. 2 and xiv. 2. David Ure mentions a case, towards the end of the eighteenth century, where two persons were prosecuted and imprisoned until they delivered up some coins and trinkets turned up by the plough in the parish of Rutherglen. *History of Rutherglen and East Kilbride*, p. 132 (Glasgow, 1793).

As to England, see Bracton, ff. 104, 120 (Rolls ed. ii. 150, 268), Coke, 3 *Inst.* 133.

who melted them and gave £529 13s. 7d. for the lot. Neither Thomas nor Willett gave anything further to Butchers, the original finder. The matter leaked out, and Thomas and Willett were prosecuted by the Crown and convicted of concealing treasure trove, and were each fined £265, and to be imprisoned until the fine was paid.[1]

The usual procedure in England is to establish the Crown's claim by inquest of office by the coroner and a jury. It must be shown (1) that the object found is treasure; (2) that it was found hidden in the earth.[2] In the Sussex case there was no evidence that the gold vessels had been hidden; this was held to be inferred from the circumstances. In a criminal prosecution, however, it would be only reasonable that the finder should have the benefit of the doubt, and that the Crown should prove its allegation.

Thesaurus inventus, as defined by Paulus, is an ancient deposit of money (*depositio pecuniae*) of which there is now no memory, so that it

---

[1] Reg. *v.* Thomas and Willett, 9 Cox, *C.C.*, 376; Leigh and Cave, *C.C.*, 313; 12 *W.R.* 108. A similar case was tried at Dublin in 1867 for the concealment of certain silver coins of the reigns of Elizabeth and Charles and the Commonwealth. Reg. *v.* Toole, 16 *W.R.*, 439; *I.R.* 2 *C.L.*, 36.

[2] Sir John Jervis gives (*The Office and Duties of Coroners*, p. 301, London, 1829) the form of an Inquisition by the Coroner, in the year 1735, as to certain finds of gold and silver coin found hidden in a vacant place in the wall of the old mansion house of Crowcombe, in the county of Devon, and (p. 303) of another as to certain gold and silver coin found in 1825 in the ground under the site of an ancient house in Bend Street, Cambridge. These are repeated in some subsequent editions, but dropped out in the last by Melsheimer (London, 1888).

In 1875 the Coroner of Bedford held an inquest as to ten old guineas, 1685-1746, and some other gold and silver coins found in pulling down an old farm house. There were also a number of other coins, but being copper they admittedly belonged to the finder, and were not treasure trove. *Associated Architectural Societies' Reports and Papers*, xiii. (1875), p. 42. A wall find of £20 in gold and 4 nobles in 1441 is mentioned. Bentley, *Excerpta Historica*, p. 150. The gold was granted by the King to the finder. Nothing is said as to the nobles.

In 1749 and 1750 there was a wall find in the old Hall at Pillaton in Staffordshire of the value of £15,749. Apparently none of it went to the Crown, *P.S.A.*, 2nd S., p. 260.

The jurisdiction of a coroner, to inquire of treasure that is found, is retained in The Coroners Act, 1887 (50 and 51 Vict., c. 71), § 36; Taylor, *Law of Coroners* (London, 1896).

has not now an owner (*dominus*).[1] This has been enlarged in English practice to cover not only gold or silver coin, but also plate or bullion. The right of the Crown is therefore limited to gold or silver bullion or coin. It extends to nothing else.[2] The great bulk of the articles found nowadays are grave furniture or *ex votos* which accompanied an interment, and therefore not of the nature of concealed treasure. If bullion or coin be found on the surface of the ground, it is not treasure trove, but belongs to the finder. An ancient Celtic torc of gold found on the surface of a field is not treasure trove. If it formed part of a concealed treasure it would be so, but if it accompanied an interment it is exceedingly doubtful whether it could be claimed by the Crown on that ground. Coin or bullion found at the bottom of a lake or in the bed of a river is not treasure trove. It is not hidden in the earth. An ancient gold ring turned up in digging a field is not treasure trove. The presumption is that it was dropped accidentally, not hidden.[3]

While the claim of the Crown to treasure trove is thus precise and limited, an attempt has been made in Scotland to extend it so as to include every relic of antiquity of every description wherever found. There

---

[1] *Dig.*, 41, 1, 31, § 1; cf. *Cod.*, 10, 15, 1; Grotius, *De Jure Belli ac Pacis*, 2, 8, 7. The definition of Paulus is copied by Bracton, f. 120 (Rolls ed. ii. 270), and from him by Coke, 3 *Inst.*, 132. Craig, *Jus Feudale*, i. 16, 40, also adopts it.

As to the later Roman law, see *Inst.*, 2, 1, 39. Mr. Vere Irving contends (*Journal Archaeological Association*, xv., p. 82) that *thesaurus* originally included all valuable things hoarded up, and was not confined to gold and silver. He refers to *Cod.*, x. 10, 15, founding on the word *mobilia*; but his view cannot be supported.

There is a long and interesting article on *Thesaurus* in Hofmanni *Lexicon*, s. v.

[2] The law of Denmark was the same. It was only antiquities of silver and gold found in the earth that had to be surrendered to the Crown. Worsaae, *The Antiquities of Ireland and Denmark*, p. 9 (Dublin, 1846); a reprint from the *Proceedings of the R.I.A.*, vol. iii.

How inefficient is the law of treasure trove to protect even plate is shown by the case of the Dolgelly paten and chalice of silver found in 1890, which were ineffectually claimed and afterwards sold by auction in London in 1892 for £710. *Archaeological Journal*, xlix., p. 83.

[3] See opinion of Sir R. B. Finlay and Mr. George H. Blakesly on a Case stated by the Society of Antiquaries in 1892, *P.S.A.*, 2 S. xiv., p. 222. See also *Ib.* xii., p. 323.

is a maxim of the law, *Quod nullius est fit Domini Regis*,[1] and this has been pressed into the service. A bronze sword, for instance, is found. It has no owner; therefore, says the Treasury, it falls to the Crown. If this rule were of universal application there would be no place for the law of treasure trove; for *thesaurus inventus*, as being *nullius*, would necessarily become the property *Domini Regis*. So too every lost article as *nullius* would belong to the Crown; nothing would belong to a finder. Nor would there be any place for *bona vacantia*.[2] They would fall to the Crown as being *nullius*. The confusion is caused by a misunderstanding. A *res nullius* does not mean a thing that once had an owner, but a thing that never had an owner.[3] The maxim, however, is of very limited scope, and it is doubtful whether it applies in Scotland to anything but land.[4] Strays and waifs fall to the Crown, but under a different rule, which again excludes the general applicability of the *nullius* maxim. It is not contended on behalf of the Crown that a cairn or a tumulus falls under the extended claim; on the contrary, it is conceded that it belongs to the proprietor of the land as *pars soli*. But a claim to its contents is advanced. For this there can be no foundation. If it be admitted that the tumulus passes with the land, its contents must pass likewise. They can be got at only by destroying the tumulus. Each stone of a cairn is

---

[1] This is the feudal rendering of the maxim of the Civil Law, *Quod enim nullius est, id ratione naturali occupanti conceditur*. *Dig.*, 41, 1, 3.

[2] *Bona vacantia* (ἀκληρονόμητα, ἀδέσποτα), properly speaking, means the property of one who dies without heirs, and which the Crown takes as *ultimus haeres*. See *Dig.*, 30, 1, 96, § 1; *Cod.*, 10, 10, 4; Ulpian, *Frag.*, 28, 7; *Consuetudines Feudorum*, 2, 56.

[3] A *res nullius* in the Civil Law was either a thing which had never actually been appropriated by any one, or which, having been appropriated, had been intentionally abandoned. It did not include articles which had been lost or forgotten. In another and broader sense *res sacrae* were *res nullius*. *Inst.*, 2, 1, 7. See *supra*, p. 57.

[4] Erskine (*Institute*, 2, 1, 11) carefully limits the application of the rule. It really applies only in the case of land where the proprietor cannot support his title by writing. No length of possession will give him a title against the Crown, for the Sovereign, as feudal superior of all the land in the country, can only be divested of this property by grant. Erskine limits *res nullius* as respects moveables to waifs and strays. Craig (*Jus Feudale*, 1, 15, 17) is of the same opinion; indeed he had a difficulty in finding an example of a *res nullius*, and selects the fish in the sea and precious stones found on the shore.

by itself a chattel, but the structure is *pars soli*, and so must be the urn it covers. A single burial urn embedded in the earth would equally pass as *pars soli*, just as an ornamental garden vase[1] or a sun-dial goes with a country house. If the new doctrine were sound, the Crown would be entitled, even against the owner of the land, to tools and weapons, flint chips and cores found on a palaeolithic floor beneath beds of soil, gravel, and clay which had been undisturbed for thousands of years. It is unnecessary to take such a claim seriously. A landowner's title covers everything in or attached to the soil; and as every grant theoretically flows from the Crown, he gets whatever at any time belonged to the Crown save anything that is *inter regalia*, such as treasure trove.

The maxim is just as inapplicable in the case of loose or portable things found on the surface. These belong to the owner of the land in virtue of possession. They are *partes soli*, and a water-worn pebble and a stone axe or a spindle whorl are equally part of the land.

A stone axe found on a road or in a public place does not fall to the Crown according to the maxim, but belongs to the finder. He must in Scotland[2] report the find to the Chief Constable, but unless claimed by the loser within a year, the object is handed back to the finder. The statute recognizes, it does not create, the right of the finder.

---

[1] A prehistoric boat found in the alluvial soil of a river was held to belong to the owner of the soil, not to tenants for a term of 99 years. Elwes *v.* Brigg Gas Company, *L.R.*, 33 Ch. D., 562. See *P.S.A.*, 2nd S., xi., p. 199. The case of an absolute grant is different. There the owner parts with the land and everything in and on it. A lease is only a contract for the possession and profits of the land, and does not give the lessee right to a chattel not intended to pass. It is of no importance that the lessor was unaware of the presence of the chattel; it was not the bargain that the tenant should have it, and therefore it remains with the lessor.

[2] In terms of the General Police Act, 55 and 56 Vict., c. 55, § 412. A similar regulation applies in many local Acts both in England and Scotland.

The rule in France is the same. A circular of the Ministry of Finance of 3rd August, 1825, directs that the finder of lost property shall deposit it in the Registry (*greffe*) of the Civil Tribunal—in Paris, at the Prefecture of Police—within twenty-four hours. If it is not claimed within three years, the general law of prescription applies (*Code Civil*, 2279); the article becomes the property of the finder, and is handed over to him, less the Court expenses for keeping it.

The absurdity of the law as at present acted on in Scotland is illustrated by a recent case. In 1880 Mr. John Sturrock, a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, obtained the consent of the tenant of the farm of Balcalk, in the parish of Tealing, to open a mound on the farm, which is the property of the Earl of Home. In the mound he found a skeleton, behind the right shoulder of which was an earthenware urn. Around the neck of the skeleton was a necklace of jet or cannel coat beads and plates, 147 in number. These articles he removed and exhibited to the Society of Antiquaries on 12th April, 1880, and subsequently discussed them in a paper, which was published in ordinary course in the *Proceedings* of the Society. The articles remained on exhibition in the Museum until 1882, when they were at his request returned to him. Mr. Sturrock had formed a valuable collection of antiquities, and on his death, in 1888, his executors in the next year advertised them for sale by auction in Edinburgh. No sooner, however, was this announced than the Earl of Home applied to the Court of Session for an interdict against the sale of the articles found on his land, which he then claimed for the first time as his property. This the executors disputed; alleged that the interment must have occurred at least 2000 years ago; and called upon his Lordship to produce a title as executor or next of kin of the deceased owner. When the case came before the Court on 22nd October, 1889, the Judge disallowed the claim of the Earl of Home, but indicated that if the articles were of antiquarian interest they should be claimed by the Crown. Thus prompted, the Queen's Remembrancer stepped in and claimed the objects as Crown property. The executors were not disposed to litigate with the Crown, and for the sake of peace submitted to the demand. The Crown next waived its rights in favour of the Earl of Home, on condition that he presented the articles to the National Museum, which he did.[1]

A grosser case of oppression under the guise of law it would be hard to figure. The articles clearly were not treasure. Cannel coal beads may have an antiquarian interest and a value in consequence, but this does not

[1] *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, vol. xxv., p. 64.

make them gold or silver. Lord Home based his claim on the fact that the articles were not of the nature of treasure trove, but had been taken by Mr. Sturrock from his property without his authority. In other words, his contention was that either as *partes soli* or as chattels not included in the lease to the tenant of the farm they belonged to him. That was certainly an intelligible claim, and it is not easy to understand how the Court got rid of it. If the claim of the Crown was well founded it would strike at the contents of every museum in the country. The only title that any one can have to a prehistoric article is that of a finder, but according to the apocryphal doctrine of the Scottish Exchequer, every masterless thing falls to the Crown and no one can acquire any right to it. If the claim in the Sturrock case is in accordance with law, the Treasury could at any time demand from the University of Glasgow its collection of altars, inscriptions, and other Roman antiquities from the Antonine Wall; length of possession and lapse of time would be no answer, for *nullum tempus occurrit Regi.*

How partial and uncertain is the action of the Treasury is illustrated in the case of the Earl of Home himself. In 1864 his Lordship exhibited at a meeting of the Society of Antiquaries various gold ornaments found in 1834 on his estate of Douglas in Lanarkshire.[1] Why did the Queen and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer not claim these along with the jet ornaments? I think he was well advised in not doing so, but that he should claim the one thing and not the other only demonstrates the absurdity of the present law and practice.

Regalia are divided into *majora*, which are *incommunicabilia*, and *minora*, which are *communicabilia*. The former cannot be separated from the Crown. The latter can, and have been frequently granted to subjects. There are many manors in England and baronies in Scotland the charters to which carry treasure trove, and in such cases when treasure is found it is claimed not by the Crown, but by the lord of the manor or owner of the barony.[2]

---

[1] *P.S.A.*, 2nd S., ii., p. 401.

[2] A case in 1837, at the instance of the Duke of Northumberland, as lord of the barony of Wark, and as such entitled to treasure trove, is mentioned by Fenwick, *Treasure Trove in Northumberland*, p. 43 (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1851, 12mo). A case arose in 1892

Apart from every other consideration, therefore, the law of treasure trove is a singularly inefficient instrument for the protection of objects, even of gold and silver, as it is inoperative in the public interest over large areas of the country. Between July, 1859, and March, 1868, only twenty-four claims to treasure trove were made by the Treasury in England. All the finds with two exceptions were of gold or silver coins, principally silver. The one exception was a bar of silver found at Erith, in Kent, and to this the Crown's right was waived; the other was the Sussex find, which went to the melting pot.[1] Mr. Rhind admits that under the law as administered in Scotland prior to 1858 very little was recovered by the Crown. Very little has been recovered since.

A law so out of date,[2] so limited, and so harsh in its operation as that of treasure trove should be swept away, and something reasonable and consistent with modern ideas and the needs of archaeological science substituted. I am aware that the Treasury, as at present in right of the Crown, allows finders of treasure the metallic value of their finds, but this meets the case only to a very small extent, and the compensation is not adequate.[3] The enforcement of the law produces much irritation, and, as has just been mentioned, the right remaining in the Crown includes but a small portion

---

in which the lord of a manor claimed against the Crown for treasure trove, Attorney-General *v.* Moore, *L.R.* 1893, 1 *Ch.* 676.

[1] See *Parliamentary Papers*, Nos. 496 of 1862; 131 of 1863; 297 of 1864; 385 of 1865; 354 of 1866; 508 of 1867; 465 of 1868. These returns were made upon the motion of Sir Jervoise Clarke Jervoise, who had a question with the Treasury in 1860 regarding a find of about 140 silver coins at Blendworth, near Horndean, Hants. See correspondence in *Parliamentary Paper*, No. 487 of 1861.

[2] It is a remnant of the time when wrecking was part of the law of Europe, and when the art of printing was claimed as part of the Royal Prerogative; see Brussius, *Principia Juris Feudalis*, pp. 86-88 (Edin., 1713); who fortifies himself with the opinion of Ahasuerus Fritsch in his *De abusibus Typographiae* and other similar but antiquated authors. Fritsch (1629-1701) treats the same subject at greater length in his *Tractatus de Typographis, Bibliopolis, Chartariis et Bibliopegis* (Jenae, 1675, 4to), translated into German by von Sincero, most probably the industrious Georg Jacob Scwindel, 1684-1752, who amongst other subjects wrote on bibliography (Regensburg, 1750, 4to).

[3] See Sir John Evans in *P.S.A.*, 2nd S., xi., p. 379; *Numismatic Chronicle*, 3rd S., vi., p. 176.

of what is valuable as archaeological material. "It does seem to me," says the late Mr. J. F. Nicholls of Bristol, "that we shall never be safe to know all, or even one half, of the most valuable hoards that are brought to light until this law of treasure trove is abrogated."[1]

In India the law has been placed on a clear and explicit footing.[2] Treasure is defined as "anything of any value hidden in the soil or in anything affixed thereto." Whenever any treasure exceeding in amount or value ten rupees (something less than a pound sterling) is found, the finder, whether the object has been found in his own or in another's land, is bound to give notice to the Collector and to deposit the treasure with the nearest Government treasury, or give security for its production. The Collector thereupon publishes a notification requiring all persons interested to appear before him at a specified time. By non-appearance any claimant forfeits whatever right he may have to the treasure. The Collector, at his official inquiry, endeavours to ascertain amongst other things "as far as possible the person by whom, and the circumstances under which, such treasure was hidden." If the Collector, as the result of the inquiry, has reason to believe that the treasure had been hidden within one hundred years by a claimant or by one whom he represents, the Collector may adjourn the inquiry to allow such claimant to bring an action in the Civil Court. If he establishes his claim, he is entitled to the treasure; if he fails, it remains with the Collector. If at the inquiry no one satisfies the Collector that he has a *prima facie* claim to the treasure, he may declare it to be ownerless. On this declaration the Collector delivers it to the finder, or, if he was not the owner of the place where it was found, he divides it between the owner of the place and the finder, in accordance with rules fixed by the Act.

By section 10 of the Act it is provided that the Collector may at any time after making a declaration that a treasure is ownerless, and before delivering it to the finder or dividing it between the finder and the owner

---

[1] *P.S.A.*, 2nd S., viii., p. 388.

[2] The Indian Treasure Trove Act, 1878 (Act No. VI. of 1878). Laws on the subject had been passed in Bengal in 1817, for Madras in 1832 and 1838, and for the Panjáb in 1872. The Act of 1878 applies, however, to the whole of British India.

of the land, declare his intention to acquire it on behalf of the Government. In that case the Collector pays a sum equal to the value of the materials, with one fifth of such value in addition, whereupon it becomes the property of the Government.

It is unnecessary for the present purpose to refer to the laws of continental countries, but a short statement of some of them will be found in the Appendix.[1]

PRESERVATION OF ANCIENT MONUMENTS.

Assuming that we have an Archaeological survey, and that we are thus put in possession of an authentic inventory of the remaining monuments of antiquity throughout the country, I would suggest that separate lists be prepared for each county, according to its parishes, burghs, or other units of local government, showing the particular monuments within each area, their situation and the names of their owners or reputed owners. This list I would transmit to each County Council, and have it published and circulated in each parish and burgh in the county in so far as applicable. At the same time, I would send a copy of the entry or entries relating to individual monuments to their owner or reputed owner, and enact that this should be notice to him and his successors of the existence of such ancient monuments upon his land.

I would continue the provisions of the Ancient Monuments Protection Act, and give greater facilities for bringing it into operation. The Act would no doubt require to be modified in some respects to bring it into conformity with the general scheme I propose, but that is matter of detail which it is unnecessary to discuss.[2]

---

[1] See Appendix C.

[2] Now that a liferenter can in England dispose of a settled estate, including the ancient monuments situated upon the property, it is rather absurd that he cannot make an effectual arrangement for the preservation of these monuments.

It may be that, as tenants for life have now such facilities for the sale of settled land, the provisions of § 9 of the Ancient Monuments Protection Act would be held to apply to them. So great are these facilities that recently two separate owners in fee endeavoured to persuade the Court that they were respectively only tenants for life. Bates *v.* Kesterton, *L.R.* 1896, 1 *Ch.* 159.

I would extend the penal clauses of the Ancient Monuments Act to all monuments on the new lists, and make it a punishable offence to injure or deface any of these. But as monuments such as barrows, cairns, and the like, suffer fully as much from inconsiderate meddling as from malicious mischief, I would make it trespass for any one to open such a monument without the consent of the owner,[1] and on his consent being obtained I would make it necessary to obtain a licence from the Local Authority. "Experience has shown," says the Curator of Ancient Monuments in India, "that the keenest investigators have not always had the greatest respect for the maintenance of monuments."[2] In granting a licence I would suggest that the Local Authority should have power to prescribe the nature and extent of the operations, the treatment of the soil or material disturbed, the disposal of objects recovered, and the restoration of the outward form of the monument. It should also be a condition of the licence that the investigator make and deliver to the Local Authority measured plans and drawings of the object before it was interfered with and accurate details of the operations carried on, lists of the articles found and information as to the exact spot where, and the circumstances in which, each article was found.[3] The undisturbed material throughout the country available for research is every day becoming scarcer, and the time cannot be far distant when it will be exhausted. Any interference, therefore, with an ancient monument for the purpose of investigation should be carefully regulated, and an accurate record pre-

---

existence for the United Kingdom, and all that is here required is a thorough revisal from an archaeological standpoint. The area of Great Britain and Ireland is 120,928 square miles.

[1] See "Constitution of the Emperor Leo the Younger, A.D. 474." *Cod.*, 10, 15, 1; Law of Russia, Appendix C.

[2] Cole, *First Report of the Curator of Ancient Monuments in India*, p. 11 (Simla, 1882, 8vo).

[3] How much may turn upon an accurate record is instanced by the Cannstadt skull, which has been accepted by some as typical of the cranium of palaeolithic man, and yet it is not in the inventory of the pleistocene mammalia found at Cannstadt in 1700. It is in the Stuttgart museum, but was not noticed until 1835, and there is no record of its provenance. See Boyd Dawkins, *Nature*, li., p. 195.

served of everything that is done.[1] Much mischief has happened by the breaking up of finds, to suit some system of classification or to give parts of it to several collections. One find kept entire, with a plan, section, and model of the barrow or other monument examined, is of more service to archaeology than twenty times the number of objects distributed in various parts of one museum or scattered about half a dozen different collections.

So much as regards such monuments and their contents as are *partes soli*. Turn now to the case of accidental finds of portable objects of antiquarian interest. I would propose to provide as regards these that the finder should in every case be bound to give notice to the Local Authority, subject to the penalty of forfeiture in case of his failing to do so; the forfeiture to operate *retro* to the date of finding, so as to prevent a legal title transmitting. Upon notice being received, it should be open to the Local Authority, for a certain time, to acquire the object on making reasonable compensation to the satisfaction of, say, the Sheriff in Scotland and of the County Court Judge in England, and failing their doing so it would be returned to the finder. Articles acquired by the Local Authority should not be saleable, except on cause shown, and on the written report of the Inspector of Ancient Monuments detailing the reasons for giving his consent. This would prevent anything like trafficking in antiquities to the loss of science and the annoyance of finders.

Sir John Lubbock had great difficulty in getting the Ancient Monuments Protection Act passed through Parliament, and he had to modify its original provisions to meet the objections of sundry landowners who treated it as an attack upon property. Any such feeling has, I believe, now passed away. None of the disastrous consequences predicted by the opponents of the Bill have followed; but, on the contrary, every one I think is satisfied that the Act is reasonable in itself, and is a step in the right direction.

---

[1] "Les fouilles pratiquées sur les points les plus intéressants ne servent trop souvent qu'à grossir les collections des amateurs d'antiquités; de vrais trésors d'observation se trouvent ainsi perdus pour la science, et il est pénible de penser que le jour n'est pas éloigné où il ne restera plus rien de ces archives vénérables, qui, seules, peuvent éclairer de quelques lueurs les secrets de notre primitive histoire."—M. Marcellin Boule in *Revue d'Anthropologie*, 3e S., iii. (1888), p. 130.

It may at first sight seem harsh to say that a man is not to interfere with what, in the eye of the law, is his own property. But the restrictions upon the use of every kind of property are innumerable, and are not felt because we are accustomed to them. A proprietor cannot build within a certain distance of a turnpike road; he cannot dig away his soil so as to deprive his neighbour of lateral support; he cannot send down sewage upon a lower proprietor; he cannot divert a stream; he cannot abstract the water as it flows through his own estate; he cannot pollute it; he cannot build a dovecot unless he has a certain rental; he cannot burn his heather except at certain seasons; he cannot kill his game except within certain times, or kill his fish at all except in the method allowed by law; he cannot carry a gun except by licence; he cannot grow an acre of tobacco;[1] he cannot paint a shield on his carriage without the authority of the Lyon King at Arms, or retain it when authorized except on a licence from the Excise; he cannot convert his grain into beer or whisky if he be so

[1] Statutes, 12 Cha. II., c. 34; 15 Cha. II., c. 7, § 17; extended to Scotland by 22 Geo. III., c. 73; see also 1 and 2 Will. IV., c. 13. The preamble of the leading Act is interesting in view of the changed relationship between this country and America. "Your Majesty's loyal and obedient Subjects, the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, considering of how great Concern and Importance it is, That the Colonies and Plantations of this Kingdom in America, be defended, protected, maintained, and kept up, and that all due and possible encouragement be given unto them; and that not only in regard great and considerable Dominions and Countries have been thereby gained, and added to the Imperial Crown of this Realm, but for that the Strength and Welfare of this Kingdom do very much depend upon them, in regard of the Employment of a very considerable part of its Shipping and Seamen, and of the Vent of very great Quantities of its Native Commodities and Manufactures, and also of its Supply with several considerable Commodities; which it was wont formerly to have only from Foreigners, and at far dearer Rates: (2) And forasmuch as Tobacco is one of the main Products of several of those Plantations, and upon which their Welfare and Subsistence, and the Navigation of this Kingdom, and Vent of its Commodities thither, do much depend; and in regard it is found by Experience, That the Tobaccos planted in these Parts are not so good and wholesome for the Takers thereof; and that by the Planting thereof, your Majesty is deprived of a considerable Part of your Revenue, arising by Customs upon Imported Tobacco; Do most humbly pray, that it be enacted by your Majesty," that no person after 1st January, 1660, shall set or plant any tobacco. The enactment is still law, although the "considerable dominions and countries" for whose benefit it was made, have long since ceased to belong to the Imperial Crown.

minded; he cannot work his coals except in accordance with stringent rules and subject to Government inspection. In towns a proprietor cannot build a house as he will, but must submit to scores of regulations as to the materials to be used, the size of the apartments, their lighting and ventilation, and the use of the building when finished. If a man finds a knife or a bracelet he cannot retain it, but must report it to the Chief Constable. Why should this apply to modern articles and not to ancient? There is no reason. The remedy is to place ancient monuments in a position similar to that of *res religiosae* under the Civil Law; to make them inalienable, and to make it punishable to injure or deface them.

The Ancient Monuments Protection Act makes provision for the protection of the monuments to which it applies. I would authorize Local Authorities where necessary to protect all monuments against injury. The removal of a monument to a place of safety is sometimes the only protection that is possible. The Local Authority should have such power of removal, but it should be made to a place as near the original site as possible; and should be permitted only in case of urgent necessity.[1]

When a monument cannot be removed, and is in danger of perishing, provision should be made for taking a cast of it. In most cases the expense would be comparatively small, and could easily be met by the Local Authority. The larger objects of which casts are most necessary are sculptured stones and crosses, and as these are suitable for the Science and Art Department, arrangements might be made with it to defray part of the cost; casts might also be taken, subject to the approval of the Inspector General, in cases where no danger was apprehended to the object. A portion of the expense would, in some cases, be recouped by the sale of a certain number of copies.[2]

I would not propose to give a definition in the Act of Parliament of

---

[1] See General Pitt-Rivers in *P.S.A.*, 2nd S., xiii., p. 175.

[2] The French Commission on megalithic monuments, finding that the sculptures on the Breton monuments are being injured by exposure, took steps to prepare careful casts of them. One set of casts is destined for the Musée de Saint-Germain, another for the museum of the Department in which the stones are situated. The remainder are for sale to other museums, French or foreign. *D'Anthropologie*, i. (1890), p. 501.

an article of "antiquarian interest" or of an "ancient monument," but this is not beyond the skill of the draftsman if it be required.[1]

RESTORATION.

There is the question of restoration. How far this is to be carried, and under what authority it is to be exercised, need not be discussed at present. I merely refer to it because it requires to be kept in view; but it is a matter of administration rather than part of a general scheme for the preservation of ancient monuments.[2]

LOCAL AUTHORITIES AS GUARDIANS OF MONUMENTS.

Exception may be taken to my proposal to make Local Authorities the guardians of ancient monuments. It will probably be suggested that a special Board should be created for the purpose. In this I do not agree. The interference of what I may call outsiders is always resented, and an Inspector sent round like a policeman would not be looked upon with favour. If the matter be left in the hands of the Local Authority, local interest will be excited, and proprietors will act much more cordially with it than with a Commissioner from London, Edinburgh, or Dublin.[3]

---

[1] As to a definition, see Wussow, *Die Erhaltung der Denkmäler*, i., p. 1 *sqq.*, ii., p. 314. In the Hungarian Law of 24th May, 1881, the expression art-monument (*Kunstdenkmal*) includes every structure (*Baulichkeit*) on or under the earth which is of value as an historical or artistic monument.

[2] Lord Canning, speaking of the Archaeological Survey of India, says, "It does not contemplate the spending of any money upon repairs and preservation. This, when done at all, should be done upon a separate and full consideration of any case which may seem to claim it." Cunningham, *Archaeological Survey of India*, vol. i., p. 2 (Simla, 1871, 8vo). As to restoration, see Cole, *First Report of the Curator of Ancient Monuments in India*, p. 35 (Simla, 1878, 8vo).

Whenever restoration is sanctioned, it should be made imperative, especially in the case of churches, that careful plans of the building should be prepared as it stood prior to its being interfered with. See *Associated Architectural Societies' Reports and Papers*, xiii. (1875), p. 37.

[3] Mr. Faussett points out that the failure of the attempt to make the law of treasure trove subservient to the interests of archaeological science was largely owing to the introduction of the policeman as the executive hand to enforce the Treasury regulations. *Archaeological Journal*, xxii., p. 30.

I have no doubt that in most Local Authorities a Committee could be found who, with the assistance of the County Engineer, would duly administer the proposed enactment. I would not abolish the Inspector of Ancient Monuments, but I would convert him into an Inspector General, and I would, in addition, appoint a suitable number of District Inspectors. These would visit their districts, confer with the Local Authorities, and see that the provisions of the Act were being carried into effect; and I would confer power upon the Inspector General, or the Science and Art Department upon the report of the Inspector General, to insist that the duty imposed by the Act on Local Authorities was properly discharged.

MUSEUMS.

The preservation of portable objects is of the utmost importance to archaeological science, and this brings me to the question of museums. Since the establishment of the great Copenhagen Museum, the idea of national museums of antiquities has prevailed, and we have such museums at Stockholm, Christiania, Saint-Germain, Edinburgh, Dublin, and elsewhere. There is much to be said in its favour, and it has worked well and with good results. It is excellent for scientists who can take advantage of the collection, but it destroys local interest, and does nothing for the general diffusion of archaeological knowledge. If there was more local interest in antiquities more would be preserved, and a far stronger national sentiment excited.[1] While many objects are lost in consequence of the law of treasure trove, far more are destroyed or neglected through ignorance. The people have no means of learning what objects of archaeological interest are like. If they knew that there was such a thing as a stone axe, and

---

[1] "The encouragement of local interest in monuments is the more essential to secure the fabrics from danger." This is said of India, but is just as applicable to the case of the United Kingdom. Cole, *First Report of the Curator of Ancient Monuments in India*, p. 12 (Simla, 1882).

"Whilst great collections in the chief capitals of the world are of incalculable importance to science, its interests are also likely to be much promoted by those local museums, still unhappily not numerous, which are devoted to the illustration of all that belongs to particular and limited districts." Chambers's *Cyclopaedia*, *s.v.* "Museum" (1st ed.).

that it was worth preserving, every one that turned up would be secured.[1]

What is wanted to meet this is the establishment and encouragement of local museums. Urban authorities in England and Ireland have power under the Museum and Gymnasium Act of 1891 to "provide and maintain museums for the reception of local antiquities or other objects of interest";[2] and part of my scheme would be to confer similar authority on County Councils, so that they could form museums, either separately or jointly as might be found suitable, that is, county museums or district museums. One of the objects of the *Société Française pour la conservation et la description des Monuments historiques* was the formation of a local museum in each department of France where one did not already exist.[3] Of the museums at such places as Caen, Nantes, Rennes, Angers, it is unnecessary to say anything. They are of inestimable value to science, and create a strong local interest in archaeology and a desire to bring everything possible to them.

All portable articles of an archaeological or historical character found within the county, and becoming the property of the Local Authority, would be deposited in the local museum.[4] Whenever an object of especial interest or exceptional characteristics turned up, the Local Authority should have the option—which I have no doubt would be exercised—of transmitting it to the National Museum[5] in exchange for

---

[1] "Les objets qu'elles [les cachettes] recélent, n'ayant aucune valeur aux yeux de ceux qui les trouvent, ne sont même pas recueillis ou sont laissés entre des mains qui les égarent. La plupart du temps on les donne à jouer aux enfants de la maison." M. Paul du Chattellier in *Matériaux pour l'Histoire primitive de l'Homme*, xxii. (1888), p. 534.

[2] 54 and 55 Vict., c. 22. The Act does not extend to Scotland or the administrative county of London.

[3] *Bulletin Monumental*, i., p. 34.

[4] Mr. T. G. Faussett, when discussing how the law of treasure trove might be turned to account, advocated the giving of local finds to local museums. It was only finds of exceptional value that he thought should be given to the National Museum. *Archaeological Journal*, xxii., p. 29.

[5] Mr. A. H. Rhind suggested that when any person entitled to excavate ancient monuments, as proprietor of the ground or as having received permission from the pro-

duplicates of more common specimens, as is done in Denmark,[1] or a cast of the object itself. When the French collection of Henry Christy was divided between the British Museum and the Musée de Saint-Germain, the latter obtained casts of the more important objects which passed to London.

The Scottish National Museum is a store-house of original material, a collection of evidences; the local museums would be not only the repositories of local antiquities, but places of popular instruction, and centres for the diffusion of information on archaeological subjects.[2] For this purpose, I would propose that they should have small typical ethnographical and anthropological collections, and be well supplied with casts and electrotype copies of archaeological subjects. In the Musée de Saint-Germain there is a long series of casts of objects preserved in the museums of Mainz, Vienna, Orleans, Rouen, Besançon, and others. The success of this plan is seen at the South Kensington Museum. The electrotypes of the Hildesheim treasure, the Bernay find, and other similar relics which are to be found in many museums in this country and in the United States are, for practical purposes, as valuable as the originals. The casts of the Ruthwell Cross and other sculptured monuments made by the Science and Art Department are more useful to the student than the originals; and by means of casts a series of monuments may be brought

---

prietor, intended to do so, he should give notice of his intention to the Queen's Remembrancer, and that on his doing so he should be entitled to retain whatever he found, on condition of sending a list to the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland of what was found. The Society was to be entitled to have the use of the articles for exhibition and drawings of the more fragile. Rhind, *The Law of Treasure Trove*, p. 25 (Edinburgh, 1858, 8vo).

[1] Worsaae, *The Preservation of Antiquities and National Monuments in Denmark*, Smithsonian Report for 1879, p. 301.

[2] "Un musée d'antiquités doit être, non pas seulement un bazaar de curiosités, mais un dépôt public où les gens d'étude puissent trouver, au besoin, des matériaux pour déterminer le caractère d'une époque, le degré de civilisation d'une nation même, s'il est possible, pour suivre les traces des conflits entre les peuples, enfin pour remonter les cours des âges, en fixant nos origines et en précisant les éléments dont la combinaison nous a fait ce que nous sommes." H. Schuermans, in *Annales de l'Académie d'archéologie Belgique*, xxii. (1866), p. 42.

together for examination and comparison, which would be otherwise impossible.[1] A large quantity of original material could easily be provided for local museums without injury to the national or central collections, and this, with copies or casts of typical specimens of such articles as would be necessary to make up a good teaching museum, would be found to be attractive and valuable, if well arranged, and the exhibits properly displayed with suitable explanations attached to them. Models to scale of barrows, underground houses, cromlechs, and the like are of great interest in themselves, and are an effectual method of preserving copies of monuments which are liable to perish, or which are not readily accessible. No part of the ethnographical or archaeological sections at the World's Fair at Chicago was more instructive than the set of models of the rock dwellings of New Mexico and Arizona, the great earthworks of the Ohio Valley, and other similar remains. A careful study of a model gives, in some respects, a more vivid impression and more accurate knowledge of the monument than a visit to the monument itself. A collection of models of our sculptured stones, says General Pitt-Rivers, "would be a means of bringing together a series of developmental forms which would seem to spread a wider knowledge of the subject, and might induce many to visit the originals who might not otherwise do so. If the popular interest in ancient monuments were increased by this means, Government might perhaps be encouraged to devote more money to the preservation of the originals."[2]

The retention of antiquities in the locality where they are found would also encourage finders to disclose their finds. Many a thing is secreted, because it is known that if it be given up it will be carried off to Edinburgh, and be buried in the Remembrancer's Office or be handed over to the National Museum, where the finder will never have an opportunity of seeing it. A man will part with his find if he knows that it will be deposited in

[1] On this point see *P.S.A.*, 2nd S., xiii., pp. 176, 321. To illustrate the development of the Celtic Cross, the Inspector of Ancient Monuments in Britain prepared models of a large number of such crosses, all carefully prepared to the scale of two inches to the foot, and showing the details of ornamentation.

[2] *P.S.A.*, 2nd S., xiii., p. 177.

the local museum, where he can see it any time, and possibly read his name as finder on the label.[1] If our ancient monuments are to be cared for, it must be largely by means of local interest, and local interest will only be elicited if the monument is retained in the neighbourhood.

I am aware of the argument in favour of national museums. The idea is that museums should represent national areas, and that every relic of antiquity of any importance found, say, in Scotland, should be deposited in the national museum, and so of England and Ireland. There is, it is contended, a national type which can only be recovered by bringing together every available relic within the national area.[2] There is no doubt some truth in this, but the type is not determined by political boundaries. Shetland and Dumfriesshire, Berwickshire and Skye, have essentially different characteristics, although they are within the same kingdom. Because the county of Northumberland is politically in England is surely no reason why its antiquarian remains should be transported to London to form a national collection. A local museum for the county or the district would, in my judgment, do far more in the interests of archaeological science than one great national collection. Nationality in this connection is just another name for centralization. Whatever be the advantages of centralization, and it has advantages, it crushes out local interest and local effort. A scheme for bringing all the sculptured stones in Scotland to the national museum in Edinburgh was recently advocated, and referring to it General Pitt-Rivers says—"I have ascertained it to be the opinion of the great majority, not only of archaeologists, but of those who are interested in keeping up the traditions and old associations of our country places, that these monuments should, whenever practicable, be preserved on their ancient sites. . . . Although the localities from which they come might be recorded, the monuments would not impress the mind so much as when seen on their own sites in the regions that gave birth to them; not to mention the bad

---

[1] *P.S.A.*, 2nd S., xiii. p. 177.

[2] See Rhind, *The Law of Treasure Trove*, p. 11; *Journal Brit. Archaeol. Association*, xv., p. 99; Cochran-Patrick in *The Transactions of the Glasgow Archaeological Society*, i., N.S., p. 367.

effect of robbing country places in the interest of the towns, a process which, on other than archaeological grounds, should be avoided as much as possible."[1]

Local museums, where they exist, have often been badly cared for, but this has arisen from the want of superintendence. If placed under the charge of a public body, they would be well administered, every article would be properly registered, labelled, and displayed, and catalogues would be published. The Blackmore Museum at Salisbury is equal to any archaeological museum in the country. The archaeological collections in the Mayer Museum at Liverpool, and in the Grosvenor Museum at Chester, are admirable. One of the features of the latter are the Roman monuments and inscriptions found in the neighbourhood. Many of the local museums in France and Germany are as well arranged, as well kept, and as instructive as the national museums.

It is only necessary to turn to the free public libraries to see how admirably an institution, involving very considerable expert knowledge, can be administered by a public body composed of ordinary citizens. It is too often forgotten that the statutes which provide for the establishment of public libraries equally contemplate the establishment and maintenance of museums, and in fact the first of what are known as the Libraries Acts was really a Museum Act.[2] Burghs, parishes, and vestries have, under the existing law, full power to establish museums and to assess for their support. County Councils and District Councils, as such, have not the like power, but district museums can, as things stand, be established by the joint action of adjoining parishes. If thought desirable, the law could easily be altered

---

[1] *P.S.A.*, 2nd S., xiii., p. 175.

[2] The Powys-Land Club, while approving of the retention of the Law of Treasure Trove, suggested that, "in order to make it appropriately applicable to antiquities," it should be provided, "not only that the objects found should be dedicated to the public by the individual finder, but also that they should remain in the district in some public museum . . . where all, including the finder, may inspect and find them." *Report of Powys-Land Club* (1874).

8 and 9 Vict., c. 43 (1845). An Act for the establishment of museums in large towns. The Bill was brought in by Mr. William Ewart, M.P. for the Dumfries Burghs.

prehistoric times, but Government does nothing to collect or preserve the material which is essential for such investigations. The editing and interpretation of our Runic monuments we owe to Professor George Stephens of Copenhagen. For a record of the Roman inscriptions in this country we have to look to Germany or to Canada. The collections of Hübner and M'Caul are, however, far from complete, and it is not asking too much that Government should undertake a new *Corpus Inscriptionum Britannicarum*[1] to be placed alongside the *Monumenta Historica Britannica* of the Record Commissioners. We are indebted to the enterprise of the Spalding Club for Dr. Stuart's *Sculptured Stones of Scotland.* That work might well be extended so as to include not only the numerous stones in Scotland which were omitted by the editor, or which were unknown to him, but also all similar monuments in England, Wales, and Ireland. I refer to inscriptions and sculptures because they are of the same character as written monuments, and it is surely just as important that these should be carefully collected and accurately transcribed and photographed as that we should have new editions of the Chronicles of the Picts and Scots, or of the Exchequer Rolls of Scotland. We are justly proud of our long series of national records. They are magnificently housed; they are placed in charge of a corps of experts; they are calendared; great numbers are printed; many of the more important have been reproduced. The Domesday survey is a unique and an invaluable record, and the eight-hundredth anniversary of its completion was celebrated as a national event. "Domesday Book," it has been said, "is the story of the life of free England, written by the hands of the free Englishmen themselves, of every separate county (except four), eight hundred years ago. It tells how they lived, what they did, and how they kept themselves free Englishmen." This is true, but these same men, those who went before and those who came after them, have written part of their story upon the face of the country, and it is still there to interpret and explain the great survey. The written

[1] In 1843, M. Villemain, then minister of Public Instruction in France, projected the publication of a collection of Latin inscriptions, similar to that now being carried on by the Academy of Berlin. It was abandoned by his successors, but the scheme was to some extent carried out by the Academy of Inscription in 1867.

record has been fac-similed and photozincographed, it has been translated and annotated, and commented on. But it is of quite as much importance that what still remains visibly on the surface of the land to tell of its early divisions, its cultivation and tenure, should be gathered together and recorded. This is but one subject that would be elucidated by an archaeological survey. Such a survey would cast light upon every epoch and upon every phase of life in the past, and would throw a flood of light upon the present.

The quarternary period is common ground to the geologist and the archaeologist. The evidences of man's presence, his tools and weapons, both palaeolithic and neolithic, the remains of the animals that were his contemporaries, the condition of the earth when they lived, fall within the sphere of geology as well as archaeology. They are dealt with to a certain extent in the geological survey. But why should the systematic survey stop at this point or be limited to the requirements of geological science? The monuments which are witnesses to man's presence, his life and labour, are surely as worthy to be collected and preserved as the fossil remains of extinct fauna and flora. The monuments of the past are not indeed wholly neglected by Government, for if an object be in itself artistic, in the opinion of the Science and Art Department, it has the sedulous care of that department, and no money is grudged for its protection and reproduction. The Ardagh chalice, for instance, is of this description, but a Roman altar or a centurial stone, no matter how valuable it may be historically, is passed by. Can anything be more inconsistent? Why is one feature in man's activity to be selected for special attention to the exclusion of every other? But on the ground of art itself something more is wanted. Properly to understand and appreciate the ornamentation of a slab we must have before us, as far as possible, the stand-point of the sculptor, his surroundings and ideas. But art did not originate within the historic period, as the museums of the Science and Art Department might suggest. The Cave-men of the palaeolithic age—the *chasseurs de rennes* of French archaeologists—were skilful artists, especially as sculptors and as engravers on bone, working with the sharp edges and points of flint flakes.[1] The sketch of the

[1] De Mortillet, *Le Préhistorique*, p. 414.

§ II. ROMAN MONUMENTS.

1. Are there to be found in the (commune of A. . . .) any fragments of an ancient road passing in the district for a Roman road, or bearing the names either of "Caesar's Way" or "*Chaussée de Brunehaut*," or any other denomination conveying the idea of its ancient importance, and of an origin more or less remote?

2. What is the direction of this road? How far can it be traced? What portion of the (commune) does it traverse?

3. What name is given to it in the district?

4. What traditions are connected with its construction?

5. What are the names of the hamlets, farms, or localities traversed by it?

6. Have there been found along these roads, particularly under crosses or amidst the foundations of any religious edifice, columns nearly similar to the mile-stones of high roads, and bearing an inscription? What can be read of this inscription?

7. Are there any regular elevations or undulations of land or earth forming an inclosure, and known under the denomination of Roman camps or Caesar's camps?

8. If a road exists, does it terminate at one of these inclosures?

9. Is there any spot to which the tradition of an ancient battlefield is attached? Is this tradition supported by any authentic facts; by a significative appellation; by any vestiges of entrenchments, or by arms, bones, graves, or other objects that have been discovered?

10. Are there found in the fields at ploughing time fragments of reddish pottery, tiles, or bricks, whole or in bits, of very fine clay and of great hardness?

11. Are any medals or coins found;—any fragments of arms, buckles, pins in bronze with or without springs, rings, short thick clumsy keys, glass objects, little cubes of clay, red, black, white, or yellow, fit for forming mosaics; little figures of men or animals in bronze or baked clay?

12. Are there to be observed, either on the surface of the ground or after excavations have been made, fragments of ancient walls, very thick, coated with small square stones, forming a regular system of work, and intersected at various distances by layers of large flat bricks?

13. What is the form of these buildings? Are they in a straight line, or do they follow a circular or semicircular direction?

14. Are fragments of marble found,—inscriptions, coins, statues, shafts of columns, capitals, pieces of sculpture, either in stone or in bronze?

15. Have there been found in places not now consecrated to purposes of worship, coffins in stone, plaister, or baked earth; placed singly or in groups? What is their direction and the nature of the stone? What has been found within? Do they bear ornaments, figures, or inscriptions? Do they appear to have been already examined?

§ III. Monuments of the Middle Ages.

1. Does the (commune of A. . . .) possess one or more churches?

2. Are there any isolated chapels, and subterranean chapels or crypts?

3. What are the dimensions of each church; the lengths internally; the width ditto?

4. Is it in the form of a cross?

5. Is the choir terminated externally, in a rectangular or semcircular manner? Is it surrounded by chapels? Do some of these chapels form a semicircular projection, and vaulted outside of the wall?

6. Of what materials is it constructed? Are any parts of it observed to be in small squared stones (commonly 'tufa') or are there at various intervals layers of large flat bricks?

7. In the inside are there pillars [piers] or columns [shafts]? How many ranges of them are there?

8. Are the pillars square, cylindrical, or composed of a bundle of columns?

9. Are these pillars or columns ornamented with sculptured capitals?

10. What do the sculptures of these capitals represent? Is it men or animals, or pearls in strings, or embroidered work, or foliage? Can the plants be made out to which the foliage belongs?

11. Are the bases of the columns flat or raised? Are they sculptured? Are there a kind of claws or feet at their angles?

12. Are there any statues in stone, either inside or outside the church, and especially under the doorways?

13. In the interior, are there, either against the walls or above the altars, little statues in wood or alabaster, painted or gilt, placed one over the other, and representing scenes of sacred history?

14. What is the form of the windows? Are they terminated rectangularly; with a circular or with a pointed arch ('*ogive*')?

15. How many times does their height exceed their width?

16. Are they supported laterally by columns?

17. Are they divided internally by stone separations? These separations—are they perpendicular, curved, or circular?

18. The windows—are they in white or in coloured glass? Are figures to be distinguished on them? What is the size of these figures? The colours—are they light or dark? Is the flesh of the figures represented by the white glass, or by a tint more or less brown? Do the figures come out upon a dark blue ground, or on a ground of landscape and architecture? On the glass, are there any inscriptions (*légendes*—labels bearing characters) to be distinguished, either in Latin or in French? Can they be read and copied? Is there no date to be found in these inscriptions?

19. If the walls and pillars are covered with lime or whitewash, cannot their coating be got off in some places, and are not traces of ancient paintings to be found on the stone?

20. Are the vaultings of the church circular or pointed; in wood or in stone? Are they painted or merely whitened? Do the edges of the vaulting project? Are their ribs angular or rounded? Are they terminated at their points of junction by circular keystones (*rosaces*) more or less sculptured, or by pendent sculptured stones (*culs de lampe*)?

21. Is there merely a ceiling instead of vaulting? Are the beams visible? Are they painted, sculptured, or perfectly plain?

22. Are the stalls of the choir or the pulpit sculptured; in wood or in stone?

23. Are there to be found in the church great flags of stone or marble serving for the pavement, and on which are traced figures of men or women, ecclesiastics or knights? Is the inscription which ought to surround these figures legible? Can it be copied?

24. Do there exist in the church any other kind of tombs, with or without statues, with or without inscriptions?

25. Are the doorways of the church rectangular, circular, or pointed? Are they supported by one or several ranges of columns? Are there any statues between the columns? What do the capitals of these columns represent? Have the doorways only one opening, or is there a pillar dividing them in the middle? Is there a bas-relief above the opening or openings? What does it represent? Of what size are the figures?

26. Is the church entered immediately, or is there a porch within or without the portal?

27. Is the roof of the church flat or pointed; covered with tiles, slates, or lead; surrounded with open work stone battlements (*galeries*)?

28. What is the form of the cornice or capping? Is it supported by little square stones representing the ends of beams, and terminated by figures of men and animals, commonly monstrosities, or by small arches, or by a kind of consoles or modilions (*corbels*)? Is it accompanied by trefoils or quatrefoils, hollowed out? Does the cornice or capping consist of mouldings, or of a running ornament with foliage?

29. Are the walls sustained by buttresses? Are these buttresses adherent to the wall? Are they detached from it, and do they support it by means of flying buttresses? Are they plain or ornamented with sculpture?

30. Is the church surmounted by one or more towers? On what part of the edifice are these towers placed? What is their form; round, square, or octagonal? Do they contain a staircase? Are they terminated by a platform, or by a roof or a spire? Is this roof or spire constructed of wood or stone, and covered with slates, tiles, or lead?

31. Does there exist in the (commune of A. . . .) any ancient abbey or convent? Of what religious order, and dedicated to what saint? Are there any remains of the conventual buildings in existence? Does the cloister still remain?

32. Are there to be found at the crossways of the (commune) or in the cemetery any stone crosses? What are their dimensions? Are they ornamented with sculptures?

33. If any isolated chapels exist, are they near to any fountain (spring) frequented by the sick? Do people go thither in pilgrimage? Do these pilgrimages take place on the eve of the saint's-day or on the saint's-day itself? What local customs or peculiar ceremonials are observed there? What kind of invalids go there?

34. Is there any ancient castle in the (commune of A. . . .)? Is it fortified? Is it in ruins or in good condition, inhabited or deserted?

35. If it is fortified, are the towers round or square, truncated above or crowned with battlements? Is it surrounded by fosses; with or without machicolations? Is there a donjon-keep? Are there any vaults?

36. What are the shape and dimensions of the windows; are they plain or decorated?

37. In the interior, are the chimney-places large? Are they ornamented with sculptures in stone, marble, or wood? Are the ceilings and wainscotings painted or sculptured? Are traces of ancient armorial bearings to be seen on the walls? Who were the proprietors before 1789 (the commencement of the great revolution)? Do the old men of the district know of any tradition relative to the castle?

38. Does any other house exist in the district ornamented with painting, sculpture, or decorations in wood or stone?

39. Is anything known, either in the castle or the church, or anywhere else, of any pictures, tapestries, ancient carved furniture, title-deeds, or archives, medals, family portraits, altar-ornaments, or, in short, any other objects belonging to an epoch more or less remote?

APPENDIX B.

THE LAW AS TO INJURY TO ANCIENT MONUMENTS.

I. The United Kingdom.

After the smashing of the Portland Vase in the British Museum, an Act (8 and 9 Vict., c. 44, 1845) was passed for the due punishment of such offences; and the enactment is repeated in the Malicious Injury to Property Act of 1861 (24 and 25 Vict., c. 97), § 39.

After the disappearance of the statue of George I. from Leicester Square, London, and the abstraction of the sword of the statue of Charles I. at Charing Cross, an Act (17 and 18 Vict., c. 33, 1854) was passed placing certain public statues under the Commissioners of Works, making provision for their maintenance and repair, and making it punishable to injure them. The latter part of the enactment is now superseded by the Act of 1861.

These Acts do not extend to Scotland, as malicious mischief is a common law offence in this country, punishable by fine or imprisonment according to the gravity of the case.[1]

Under the English Acts, malicious injury to an object of art or the like in a museum or other public building is constituted a special offence, and by § 51 of the Act of 1861 the law is extended to malicious injury to any property where the damage exceeds £5. This covers the case of an angry man smashing a draper's plate-glass window, but who is to assess the damage to an ancient monument? For five shillings a mason might be able to make it look as well as ever, but the work of the iconoclast may have destroyed its characteristic features. The case is perhaps even more difficult to reach in Scotland, as to constitute malicious mischief there must be the indulgence of cruel or malicious passion or an attempt to concuss others by injuring their property. The law of Scotland does not distinguish between objects in a field and those in a museum. The law of England is much more stringent; objects in museums are protected, be their commercial value small or great, and the same applies to public statues and memorial monuments in churches and churchyards.

Defacing of monuments in churches or churchyards, says Lord Coke, is punishable by the common law.[2] When a church is rebuilt, the monuments are to be carefully taken down and re-erected in the new church (The Church Building Act, 1819, 59 Geo. III., c. 134, § 40). It is a punishable offence in England to injure or deface a monument in a cemetery (The Cemeteries Clauses Act, 1847, 10 and 11 Vict., c. 65, § 58). The statute 3 and 4 Edward VI., 10, for destroying images and pictures, spared tombs and monuments.

II. France.

"Whoever shall have destroyed, thrown down, mutilated, or defaced monuments, statues, and other objects destined for purposes of public utility or ornament, and erected by the public authority or with his sanction, shall be punished by imprisonment for a period of from one month to two years, and a fine of from one hundred to five hundred francs."[3]

---

[1] Macdonald, *Treatise on the Criminal Law of Scotland*, p. 115, ed. 1894.

[2] 3 *Inst.*, 202: see Little, *The Law of Burials*, p. 61, 2nd ed. (London, 1894).

[3] *Code Pénal*, § 257, "Dégradation des monumens."

III. GERMANY.

§ 303. "Any one who maliciously and unlawfully damages or destroys property belonging to another shall be punished by a fine up to 1000 shillings, or by imprisonment with labour up to two years. The attempt to commit this offence is criminal.

§ 304. "Any one who maliciously and unlawfully damages or destroys objects of veneration of a religious society existing in the State, or things dedicated to divine service, or tombs, public monuments, objects of art, science, or trade preserved in public collections or publicly exhibited, or objects which serve for public use or for the beautification of public roads, places, or pleasure-grounds, shall be punished by imprisonment up to three years, or by a fine up to 1500 shillings (marks). Together with the punishment of imprisonment with labour, the sentence may include the forfeiture of civil privileges. The attempt to commit these offences is criminal."[1]

APPENDIX C.

THE LAW AS TO TREASURE TROVE.

I. THE CIVIL LAW.

"THE Emperor Hadrian, in accordance with natural equity, granted treasure which a man found in his own land to the finder; and made a similar grant in the case of him who accidentally found a treasure in a sacred or religious place. But if a person, without express search but by chance, found a treasure in land belonging to another, he granted half to the finder and half to the owner of the land. Consequently, if anything be found in the Imperial demesne (*in Caesaris loco*), he ordained that half should go to the finder and half to the Emperor. In like manner, if a man find anything in ground belonging to the Treasury (*fiscus*) or to the public, one half will belong to the finder and the other to the Treasury or the city (*civitas*)."[2] This rule was substantially repeated in a constitution of Leo the Younger, A.D. 474.[3] As a reason for dividing between the finder and the owner of the soil, the constitution adds, "For thus it will happen that each will enjoy his own and not gape for that of his neighbour." The civil law was practically re-enacted in a constitution of the Emperor Frederic.[4]

---

[1] *The Criminal Code of the German Empire.* Translated by Geoffrey Drage. §§ 303, 304, p. 278 (London, 1885).

[2] *Inst.*, 2, 1, 39, Orloff, *Commentatio Iuris Romani de Thesauris* (Erlangen, 1818).

[3] *Cod.*, 10, 15.

[4] *Consuetudines Feudorum*, 2, 56. See *A Summary View of the Feudal Law with the*

After
London.
Charin
public
mainten
part of
The
law on
the gr
U
a mu
of the
where
a dr
mon
as c
feat
c



III. The Law of Austria.

The Austrian Ordinances of 24th February and 2nd November, 1779, of 14th February, 1782, and 5th March, 1812, relate to finds of ancient coins and their transfer to the Cabinet of Coins, compensation being made. The Ordinance of 1812 extended their scope to antiquities of bronze or stone, such as figures, statues, busts, weapons, carved stones, etc., inscribed stones, and grave stones. The compensation for finds purchased by the authorities was to be on a reasonable scale.[1]

The General Austrian Code makes regulations as to all things which are found of greater value than two florins, including treasure, which is specially defined (§ 398). "If the discovered thing consists of money, jewellery, or other precious things, which have been so long concealed that their former proprietor can no longer be discovered, they are called treasure." Any ordinary article to which no effectual claim is made within one year belongs to the finder. In the case of treasure, the finder gets only one third, one third falling to the owner of the land, the remaining third to the State.[2]

IV. The Law of Hungary.

The edicts of 6th August, 1812, 3rd August, 1813, and 11th April, 1815, relating to treasure trove, extend to portable monuments, as treasure, according to Hungarian law, includes objects of scientific and artistic interest, such as Greek, Roman, Pagan, or more recent trinkets, weapons, and ancient coins. Every find of this description must be notified to the authorities, by whom the value of the object is determined. The value is divided amongst the owner of the place where the find was made, the Treasury, and the finder, or, where notification has been neglected, the informer. If the object possesses scientific or artistic value, the Hungarian National Museum has the right of pre-emption, and, failing it, the University of Buda-Pest.[3]

V. The Law of France.

The *Code Civil*.

According to the *Code Civil*,[4] the property in a treasure found in a man's own land belongs to himself; if found in another person's land, one moiety

---

The provision of the General Prussian Code (Part ii., Title 20, § 6) punishing the use of magic was repealed in 1871, and the Penal Code of that year substituted.

[1] Wussow, *Die Erhaltung der Denkmäler*, i., p. 192.

[2] *General Code for the Austrian Monarchy*, translated by Winiwarter, § 389-401 (Vienna, 1866, 8vo).

[3] Wussow, *Die Erhaltung ger Denkmäler*, i., p. 209.

[4] *Code Civil*, § 716: cf. §§ 539, 713, 717, 768; Laurent, *Principes de droit civil Français*, T. viii., § 447 *et seq.* (Paris, 1873).

belongs to the finder and the other moiety to the owner of the land. Treasure is defined as everything concealed or hidden which no one can establish to be his property, and which is found purely by the effect of chance. These terse and apparently explicit rules have, however, been the subject of much litigation. An article found on the surface, not being either concealed or hidden, is not treasure but waif (*épave*), and is regulated by other provisions of the Code, but courts and lawyers take different views as to the section that is applicable. The State has claimed as in right of masterless goods (*biens vacans*), but apparently without much success. The aid of the ancient Coutumes has been invoked; but in vain. These, it is held, are all superseded by the Code. The city of Paris and other bodies have attempted to make municipal regulations, but these have been challenged as *ultra vires*, being contrary to the fundamental provisions of the Code, which alone is law.

The partition between finder and owner does not apply in the case of excavations undertaken for the purpose of making discoveries, nor to valuables found in a tomb in a field. A treasure concealed in a wall is held as appurtenant to the land and not as an accessory to the building. If, therefore, the proprietor sells the materials and a treasure is found during its demolition, it belongs to the owner of the site, not to the purchaser of the material.

THE OLD LAW.[1]

64. With regard to treasure hidden in the earth, in a field, or in a house, the question has been raised whether it ought to belong *jure inventionis* to the finder, or to the proprietor of the field or house where it was found, *jure accessionis*, as a pertinent. The Roman lawyers determined the question by giving one half of the treasure to the finder and the other half to the owner of the field.[2]

By the French law treasure is divided between the superior having baronial jurisdiction (*le seigneur haut-justicier*) in the territory in which the treasure was found, the owner of the place where it was found, and the finder, each taking one third.

65. The finder of a treasure has right to a share only if he has found it by chance; as, for instance, when a man, in digging a ditch in a field by order of the owner, finds a treasure, or when a cleanser of wells or sewers finds a treasure in them. But if without the consent of the proprietor one has made excavations in a field in search of treasure, and has been successful, the single law of the Code *de thesauris* ordains that in this case he shall not have a share,

---

[1] Pothier, *Traité du droit de Propriété*, i. 2, 4, § 2.
[2] *Inst. tit. de rer. divis.* § 39 (*Inst.* 2, 1, 39).

because he ought not to profit by his own wrong in digging in another's field without his consent.

66. Note that by treasure we understand a thing of which we have not any indication to whom it formerly belonged: *Thesaurus*, says Paul, *est vetus quaedam depositio pecuniae, cujus non extat memoria, ut jam dominum non habeat.*[1] But if there be any indication or presumption which points to the person who has concealed the money or other object in the place where it was found, it ought not in this case to be considered as treasure, but belongs to the person who hid it or to his heirs, to whom the finder must deliver it, *Alioquin*, adds Paul, *si quis aliquid vel lucri causa, vel metus, vel custodiae, condiderit sub terra, non est thesaurus, cujus etiam furtum fit.*

Scaevola gives this example: *A tutore pupilli domum mercatus, ad ejus refectionem fabrum induxit; is pecuniam invenit. Quaeritur, ad quem pertineat? Respondi: si non thesauri fuerunt, sed pecunia forte perdita, vel per errorem ab eo, ad quem pertinebat, non ablata; nihilominus ejus eam esse, cujus fuerat.*[2]

Si non thesauri fuerunt, that is to say, if it did not appear that this money was treasure, as would be the case if it consisted of ancient coins, which appeared to have been put in the place where they were found at a remote time, and in such a manner as made it impossible to know by whom they had been deposited. If, on the other hand, it should appear that the deposit was recent, as, for instance, because it consisted of pieces of modern issue, the presumption in this case is that the money had been placed there by the father of the minor when he occupied the house; that this money was only mislaid; that it was by mistake that the tutor in selling the house had not removed it from the place for want of knowing where it was; and that this money, having always continued to belong to the father of the minor, must be restored to the tutor of the minor as heir.

VI. The Law of Spain.[3]

THE CIVIL CODE.

348. Property is the right to enjoy and to dispose of a thing, without any restrictions other than those imposed by law.

---

[1] *L.* 31, § 1, ff. *De acq. rer. dom.* (D. 44, 1, 31, § 1): see *supra*, p. 61.

[2] *L.* 67 ff. *De re vind.* (*D.* 6, 1, 67).

[3] A Civil Code for Spain was promulgated upon 24th July, 1889. It does not, however, supersede the *fuero* or customary law, which is allowed to remain (*Code* § 12), so that in fact the new law, in a manner, merely supplements the old.

The Code is based to a very large extent on that of France, but the arrangement is more scientific and the draftsmanship better. It is a clear and methodical statement of the general principles of law.

The proprietor can sue the possessor and holder for the purpose of reclaiming it.

349. No one can be deprived of his property, except by competent authority, and for a proved case of public advantage and on receiving full compensation.

If such compensation has not been paid, the judges will maintain and, if need be, reinstate the owner in possession.

350. The proprietor of a piece of land is owner of what is on it and under it; he can make such works, plantations, and excavations as he thinks proper, having regard to existing servitudes and conforming to the laws regarding mines and water and police regulations.

351. Hidden treasure belongs to the owner of the land in which it is found.

If, however, the find be made in the property of another person or of the State, and by chance, the half goes to the finder.

If the objects found are of scientific or artistic interest, the State may acquire them at their just value, which will be apportioned as aforesaid.

352. By treasure is meant, in this connection, a secret and unknown hoard of money, of trinkets or other precious objects, the lawful proprietorship of which is not established.

614. Whosoever, by chance, finds a treasure in the property of another will have the right granted to him by article 351.

615. The finder of a moveable, which is not treasure, must hand it over to its former possessor. If he is unknown he must deliver it to the Alcalde of the place where it was found.

The Alcalde will give public notice of it in ordinary form on two consecutive Sundays.[1]

If the article cannot be kept without loss or without expense disproportionate to its value, it will be sold by auction on the expiry of eight days after the second notice if the owner has not appeared, and the proceeds will be deposited.

After the lapse of two years from the second notice, if the owner has not appeared, the article found, or the sum realised by its sale, will be handed to the finder. The latter, in the same manner as the owner, is bound to pay the expenses.

616. If the owner appears in time, he shall be bound to reward the finder with a tenth part of the value of the article found, or its price if sold. If the value exceeds 2000 *pesetas* the reward as respects the surplus will be reduced to a twentieth.

---

[1] This was the practice under the old French customary law. Thus by the Coutume d'Orleans, *art.* 65, "Strays (*épaves*) must be proclaimed on three several Sundays, at sermon at parish high mass, and in the place where they were found, on court days, at the instance of the barons—greater or less (*seigneurs de haute, moyenne et basse justice*)—or of the finder of the strays." Pothier, *Traité du droit de Propriété*, i. 2, § 3.

THE OLD LAW.[1]

"The treasure which is found upon the earth, or concealed in it by any one, is applied to the benefit of the Exchequer (*al fisco*), with a reservation of the fourth part for the finder, who ought to communicate the discovery to the justice."[2]

VII. The Law of Denmark.

THE CODE OF CHRISTIAN V.[3]

CHAPTER IX.—OF THINGS FOUND.

Article 3. Whatever gold or silver is found in the hills or in plowing or otherwise, is the property of the king alone, and is called the Treasure of Denmark.

VIII. The Law of Russia.[4]

Treasure, by which is meant objects of value hidden in the earth or in a wall, belongs, according to the law of Russia proper (*Svod Zakanov'*), to the owner of the land, without distinguishing between the case where the owner has himself been the finder and that of a stranger having found it. Under this code no private person and no local authority can undertake or authorize excavations on the land of another without his consent.

In the Governments of Tchernigof and of Poltava, in Poland, as well as in the Baltic Provinces, when a treasure has been found by chance on the property of another, a private person, a corporation, or the Crown, it is divided between the owner of the land and the finder. If it be found by the landowner himself it belongs wholly to him. The case is the same where the find is due to excavations undertaken by a third person, either by authority of the landowner

---

[1] Johnston, *Institutes of the Civil Law of Spain*, p. 101 (London, 1825, 8vo).

[2] L. 3, tit. 22, Lib. 10, *Novísima Recopilacion de las Leyes de España*; L. 1, tit. 13, Lib. 6, *Leyes de Recopilacion*, which alters L. 45, tit. 28, P. 3, *Leyes de Recopilacion*. See Lagunez, *De Fructibus*, pars. i., cap. 11 (Lugduni, 1702, fol.).

[3] *The Danish Laws, or the Code of Christian the Fifth, faithfully translated for the use of the English inhabitants of the Danish Settlements in America*, p. 334 (London, 1756, 8vo).

[4] The general law of Russia is contained in the *Svod Zakanov'* published in 1833, and in force since 1st January, 1835, subject to periodical amendment. The kingdom of Poland is still substantially subject to the Code Napoleon, which was introduced in 1808. In the Baltic Provinces their own customary law prevails. It was reduced to order under the direction of Alexander II. (*Liv-est-und curlaendisches Privatrecht*) and published in 1864 (St. Petersburg, 1864, 4to). The Grand Duchy of Finland, which was only separated from Sweden in 1809, is still governed by the Swedish Code of 1734 (*Sveriges Rikes Lag ed. Sjöros et Sulin*, Helsingfors, 1874, 8vo).

or without his knowledge. On the other hand, when treasure is found on land which has no owner, the finder alone is entitled to it (*Code of the Baltic Provinces*, 745 *seqq.*). The legislator for the Baltic Provinces had a difficulty in deciding, in the case where the *dominium utile* of the land had been separated from the *dominium directum*, whether treasure trove should belong to the vassal or to the superior, but following local customs he decided in favour of the vassal (*Ib.* 950), a decision which is considered not free from criticism.

The same code determines that objects which have been hidden or buried, but which are not technically treasure, either because it is impossible to say to whom they should go, or because they have been found in a chattel, are to be assimilated, in so far as concerns appropriation, not to treasure trove, but to strays or finds of ordinary articles. The owner of an article which has been found is not bound to recompense the finder if he proves that he knew where it was concealed[1] (*Ib.* 742, 743, 748).

IX. The Law of Turkey.[2]

According to Mussulman law, if discovered treasure bears an Islamite mark, it is ranked amongst objects lost and found (*loqta*), and in this case it is subjected only to the relative dues; but if it bears an emblem of infidelity, such as the figure of an idol or of a cross, it will be subjected to "Khoums." According to the regulations applicable to things lost and found (*loqta*) no inanimate object found, worth more than one dirhem, can be the object of a use or of a location without the consent of its legitimate owner. Sometimes, however, "whatever is found in the desert, or buried in the earth, or in the intestines of animals, or in the bosom of waters, without its being possible to know the owner, becomes the entire property of the finder."[3] "Khoums," to which the non-Islamite treasure is subjected, literally means "the fifth part," which, in the cases laid down by the law, the Mussulmans must allow to be deducted as tax from their patrimony.[4]

---

[1] Lehr, *Eléments de droit civil Russe*, p. 240 (Paris, 1877, 8vo).

[2] Ongley, *The Ottoman Land Code*, pp. 58, 335 (London, 1892, 8vo).

[3] Tornauev, *Droit Mussulman, Traduit en français par Eschbach*, p. 283 (Paris, 1860, 8vo).

[4] *Op. laud.*, 61, 62. There is a special law relating to excavations and search for coins, etc. 22 Rebr-ul-Akher 1301, *i.e.* $\frac{3}{11}$ Feb. 1884), Wussow, *Die Erhaltung der Denkmäler*, ii., p. 314.

Glasgow Cathedral

Section of low building at N.W. corner of lower church
shewing elevation of part of west bay of choir

No. II.

THE HALL OF THE VICARS CHORAL, GLASGOW CATHEDRAL.

BY

THE MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP EYRE, LL.D., D.D.

[*Read at a Meeting of the Society held on 19th December*, 1895.]

AGAINST the outside of the north wall of the Cathedral of Glasgow is a low building, now roofed with flags. It stands between the two buttresses at the west end of the north aisle of the choir. To a stranger or a casual observer it would seem to be an erection of no great age, and put up to serve the purpose of a temporary outbuilding. To those acquainted with the various parts of the church it is and has for long been a puzzle.

A crude surmise or guess was made by Mr. Archibald M'Lellan in his *Essay on the Cathedral Church of Glasgow*, who speaks of it as a ruinous building supposed to have been a dormitory. This supposition has been reproduced by Mr. J. Collie in his *Plans, Elevations, etc., of the Cathedral of Glasgow*, p. 3. Allusion is made to this building in the article "A Mediaeval Architect," by Mr. Macgregor Chalmers in *Scots Lore*, 1895, No. 2, where he says: "The low walls of an unfinished thirteenth century building, to the east of the north transept, were used for the first time a few years ago for the existing brick and stone tool house" (p. 93). That it was not meant as the sub-structure of a north transept, to correspond with what was contemplated for the south side, is abundantly clear from the fact that it is east of where a north transept would be placed; and that it was meant to be a loftier building than its present height is clear from the numerous and massive buttresses at its sides and angles.

The object of the present paper is an endeavour to show that the building in question was a hall meant for the use of the vicars choral; and that it is the hall spoken of in old documents as *aula vicariorum chori*.

the late Archdeacon of Glasgow for the use of their common table (B. 386). On the same north side of the church, between the archbishop's garden on the west and the place of the vicars on the east, there was some land and a garden belonging to them. It was let in 1491 to Mr. Michael Fleming, prebendary of Ancrum. The said canon bound himself to build, within three years, in the front of this land *unam domum cum duabus voltis deorsum, et cameris desuper tegulis tectis, in sufficiente et honesta forma* (A. 473). This house was let in 1508 to Mr. James Stewart, prebendary of Ancrum (B. 247).

Though the homes of these vicars were on the north side of the cathedral, as again seen in the document regarding Alex. Panter, vicar of the choir, where the words are used *in camera sua in loco vicariorum de Glasgw* (B. 457), they had some property in other spots, given to them by benefactors to the church. A tenement on the north side of the Raton Row belonged to them (B. 489). A curious document of the date 1477, refers to this tenement, and has a special interest as being a specimen of the vernacular language of the period. It is printed in A. 458; also in Marwick's *Charters and Documents*, Part ii. p. 66; and again in M'George's *Old Glasgow*, p. 61. From this document it appears that the vicars of the choir had the right to a ground annual from this tenement. The annual for some time had not been paid, and the vicars were unable to recover it from the property in consequence of the tenement having fallen into a dilapidated state. The proprietor had died, and his heirs having failed to pay the arrears, the vicars took proceedings to obtain possession of the ground. A trial took place before John Stewart, provost, and Jas. Stewart and John Robinson, bailies; and the result was that the vicars were invested in the absolute property of the tenement. This tenement some thirty-five years later was let by the vicars, with the consent of the dean and chapter, to Mr. Geo. Kerr in 1513 (B. 489). They had also some tenements on the south side of the Drygate, and west of the house of Mr. Thos. Murehead, rector of Govan (B. 365). A house belonging to them was let by them, in 1508, to Patrick Graham, Rector of Killerne, for 24s. a year (B. 410); and some land belonging to them was let to Janet Purvians (B. 86).



Glasgow Cathedral

North elevation (from Collie) of low building at N.W. corner of lower church





Glasgow Cathedral

Plan of low building at N.W. corner of lower church



The duties of the vicars choral were to serve and sing in the choir of Glasgow. An instrument, of date 12th June, 1511, relates that Sir Thos. Conigham received the appointment of chaplain of the chapel of St. Mary in the lower church, and took the oath, in presence of the dean and other members of the chapter, that he would serve and sing in the choir of Glasgow with the other choristers (B. 411). Among their other duties may be mentioned that they were to celebrate mass thrice a week for the soul of Michael Fleming, canon, and to keep one anniversary; for the first of which services the canon left an annual income of 5 merks 4s. 8d., and for the anniversary 20s. (A. 463). In the year 1430 it was arranged that the vicars should celebrate daily on the high altar, *in magno altare de requie*, a mass for all the deceased bishops (A. I. xxxii.).

Their places in the choir were arranged in this manner: "The canons in residence, during the time of their residence and of divine service, will take their places on each side in the higher and more dignified seats, with the exception of the chancellor and treasurer, who will take the return stalls; and the vicars will take the stalls immediately below the canons on each side of the choir" (A. 353). During the singing the cantors grouped themselves at the lectern in the choir (A. 356).

A document, of date 1506, shows that the vicars of the choir took an oath, in the presence of the dean and chapter, that they would perform their duties faithfully (B. 131).

For the musical services of the church, in addition to the vicars choral, there were some boy choristers. Bishop John arranged, in 1427, that the prebendary of Strathblane, who was to be a cleric *cantu bene et notabiliter instructus*, was to pay to four boys for singing in the cathedral 16 merks, *i.e.*, to each boy 4 merks a year, at the four terms in the year, as the canons paid their stallars. The said prebendary was, either himself or through someone else, *predictos* 4 *pueros, qui pro tempore fucrint, in cantu sufficienter ac diligenter instruere* (A. 328). In 1432 the prebendary of Durisdeer, the sub-precentor, had to provide the aliment for six boy choristers (A. 346). An instrument records that in February, 1507, the dean, Mr. Robert Forman, and the chapter granted to John Panter an annual salary of 10 merks, over and above the yearly support from the sub-precentor,

to be received for his constant service and daily practice in singing and music with the other ministers, vicars, and boys of the church of Glasgow. And the same Panter, by holding up his hand as a sign of the promise made, faithfully promised the dean that he would give his daily service and practice in singing with the other ministers of the church (B. 252).

The canon precentor in 1213 was a canon named Robert (A. 93); in 1227 also named Robert (A. 121); in 1238 also Robert (A. 200); in 1258 it was Simon (A. 166, 174); David, who died in August, 1467, was precentor (A. 616), and he was one of the four canons who were chosen in 1432 to make an inventory of all the ornaments, relics, and jewels belonging to the cathedral (A. 329); David Cadzow in 1493 (A. 329); and John Steinstoun or Stevenson was precentor in 1556 (A. 581). His sub-precentor was John Hamilton, and they were the last holders of those offices before the break-up of 1560.

The salary and emoluments of the vicars can be gathered from various instruments. The original rate seems to have been 8 merks.[1] At a meeting in the chapter house on 22nd May, 1510, Mr. John Gibson, prebendary of Renfrew, proposed to increase the salary of his stallar, and of his vicar of the choir serving in the same stall, by 2 merks, so as to be 10 merks annually, if the other prebendaries would do the same (B. 352). In the year 1480 the dean and chapter agreed to increase the stipends of the vicars choral serving in their stalls, so that those who had previously received five pounds would in future each receive ten pounds from the prebendary in whose stall he served, and this arrangement was to bind their successors (A. 443). Mr. George Ker, prebendary, consented to give in future to his stall-vicar of Old Roxburgh, or to the stall-vicar of Newbottle, 9 merks yearly, and on the following year (1511) he was to decide whether to apply this increase of 20s. to his stall of Old Roxburgh or of Newbottle, and that

[1] The silver merk was an old Scottish coin, value 13s. 4d. Ten merks was £6 12s. 8d. The comparative value of money, then and now, may be inferred from the fact that in 1507 the purchase price of a tenement with an acre of land, in the burgh of Kirkintilloch, was twenty merks (B. 216). A merk (not silver) was a sum of 13⅓d. An instance in point is where a tenant of Chanonland was ordered to remove from the said lands under a penalty of 40d. or 3 merks for each day that he remained (B. 282).

afterwards it would be regularly paid by himself and by his successors (B. 356). The dean and chapter and the vicars of the choir, assembled in general chapter, in the year 1510, agreed to an arrangement as follows: That Mr. Rowland Blacader, the sub-dean, should give 15 merks annually to his stall-vicar in place of the usual tax of 10 merks; that during his lifetime he should have the presentation; and that after his death the dean and chapter should present to the stall the senior vicar of the choir, with the 15 merks attached to it; and that this senior vicar should only be bound to the great hours in the choir of Glasgow and to the masses connected therewith, and that he should pay his fines for absence, etc. (B. 355).

The canons distributed to the vicars yearly, at Whitsunday, their share of the common goods. An instrument, of date 1511, records the consent and resolution of the vicars of the choir, that the stall-vicar of the sub-dean and of his successors, for the observance of the greater hours, should have their share with the vicars of all casual and common monies belonging to the vicars, both for obits and for other divine services (B. 414). The vicars, with the exception of one, made a complaint to the president and chapter, that the payments, when the sub-precentor absented himself from the choir services, were not given to the vicars as provided for in the foundation (B. 367).

As the vicars were a corporation or a college, they had their official or procurator to look after their interests and to defend their rights. A case in point is recorded, in 1504, in an instrument in which Sir Thos. Forsyth, as their procurator and in their name, protested against Sir Wm. Smyth holding the half of the common goods belonging to the vicars, without submitting to the same burden as the vicars did for their common goods (B. 73). Another instrument, dated 1505, shows that Mr. Wm. Brown, procurator of the vicars of the choir, received sasine of the annual rent of 8s., purchased by Mr. Michael Fleming for the sum of 8 merks, as an augmentation of the half chaplaincy founded by the said Mr. Michael at the altar of St. Nicholas in the lower church, to be paid to the said vicars and their successors yearly (B. 117). Mr. Wm. Brown was succeeded in this office by Mr. Richard Bothwell. An instrument, dated 9th March,

1509, shows that Mr. R. Bothwell undertook to act as the procurator for the vicars of the choir in all their present and future causes (B. 324).

The editor of the *Registrum Epus Glasguensis*, in a note to the preface, takes it for granted that the vicars residential and the vicars of the choir were the same. He says: "These vicars residentiary, established for the decorum and solemnity of cathedral service, who are often called *stallarii*, and in Glasgow as well as in other cathedrals, had ultimately a regular constitution under the title of Vicars of the Choir" (A. xxxi.). That the term *vicarios* and *stallarios* were identical is evident (A. 346), but that the *vicarios* and the *vicarios chori* were the same is not at all clear. On this account we have spoken of the former as stall-vicars and of the latter as vicars choral—the one set of vicars serving in the stalls of the choir, and the others singing in the choir.[1]

Though the instrument of Bishop William Lauder might at first sight seem to show the identity of these vicars (A. 312 and 414), there are many reasons for the contrary. (*a*) *Their number.*—The vicars choral were twelve, whereas the stall-vicars must have been thirty, more or less. The canons would find that there was a considerable difference between providing for twelve and for thirty vicars. (*b*) *Their dwellings.*—The vicars choral all lived on the north side of the cathedral on a spot known as the place of the vicars; but the stall-vicars mostly dwelt in the Rotten Row (A. lviii.). (*c*) *Their relation to the chapter.*—The cantors or vicars choral were under the precentor as their superior (A. 169), whilst the stall-vicars were under the charge of the dean (A. 169). (*d*) *Difference shown in the statutes.*—In the statutes "De cultu Divino," etc., it is said that some of the canons are to be chosen as masters of ceremonies, and then adds, *et certi vicarii, tanquam similes magistri ceremoniarum intra vicarios chori* (A. 350). (*e*) *Their exceptional position.*—In these same statutes an exceptional office and duty is assigned to the vicars choral: "And moreover certain vicars choral will be chosen with jurisdiction as penitentiaries and hearers of the confessions of the canons, the vicars of the choir, and

[1] The terms are a little obscure, as some are spoken of as *vicarii in choro ministrantes* (A. 415).

of the other members, with the power of absolving from all cases reserved or not" (A. 350). (*f*) *The stall-vicars had to act as deacons and sub-deacons* when the mass was sung by the canons whom they represented (A. 345); and this duty could not be undertaken by those who were employed in the music and were collected at the lectern. The most that can be said, if these arguments be not convincing, is that many of the vicars choral were stall-vicars, but that all the stall-vicars were not vicars choral. At the same time it is to be understood that the stall-vicars were an organized body with many rights and privileges. A document, dated 16th June, 1487, regarding the foundation of a chaplain for the altar of Corpus Christi in the cathedral, bearing three seals, has that of the vicars, and is described as the seal "Vicariorum Glasguensis ecclesiae ex cera rubea super alba, exhibens mitram episcopalem nova forma, sub mitra baculum, super baculo piscem transversum annulum ore tenentem: inscriptum in circumferentia, *Sigillum vicariorum Roberti Episcopi Glasguensis*" (A. II., xix.).

The above notes are introductory to the question as to the purpose and use of the building on the north side of the cathedral. The contention put forward in this paper is that the building was the erection spoken of in old documents as the *aula vicariorum chori.*

In five different deeds or instruments this term is used. The first mention is in an instrument of date 16th July, 1505, narrating that Peter Colquhoun, as agent for John Scot, appeared before Mr. David Conigham and Adam Colquhoun, canons, bailies of Chanonland, sitting in judgment *in aula vicariorum*, alleging that the said John had his mother's consent, and wished to be rented in the tack belonging to and then possessed by her (B. 118). The second document is dated 30th October, 1506. The same canons, D. Conigham and A. Colquhoun, bailies of the Chanonland,[1] and sitting in judgment *in aula collegii vicariorum chori*, received an application to the effect that Catherine Stirrat, now married to Edward Johnson,

[1] The lands called the Chanonland (called elsewhere "The 40 merkland of the Chanons that belonged to the Archbishop of Glasgow), situated in the Bailiery of Cuningham and shire of Ayr, were originally granted to the Church of Glasgow by the munificent Devorgilla, mother of John Baliol, and confirmed by Alexander III. of Scotland, in 1277 (A. 192), and were afterwards appropriated to the canons.

should enjoy as rentrix the tack of the 13s. lands in the Chanonland, in which her first husband, Thomas Clerk, died last rented. The instrument ends, *Acta judicialiter in aula vicariorum* (B. 148). The third document takes us to the year 1510. It narrates that Mr. Richard Bothwell and Sir Robert Fawside were deputed by the canons to inquire about some household utensils belonging to the vicars. It ends with the words *Acta in aula vicariorum in Glasgow* (B. 386). A fourth instance of the use of this term occurs under date 3rd May, 1511. It is a protest by Sir Bartholomew Blare, perpetual chaplain of the chaplaincy of St. James, within the Church of Glasgow, and in presence of witnesses, Mr. Thos. Heslop, Sir Wm. Brown, Alex. Panter, and Adam Smerles, against the decree passed by James, Archbishop of Glasgow, by which David Gardinar was to be relieved of the annual payment of 5s., and which was to be paid by Sir B. Blare and his successors. This was done *in aula vicariorum chori* (B. 403). The fifth document is of date 5th October, 1511. It is an instrument narrating that Mr. Wm. Brown, in the presence of Mr. Rowland Blacader, sub-dean, Adam Colquhoun and Nicolas Greenlaw, canons, and other priests, *in aula vicariorum chori*, on learning from Mr. A. Colquhoun that Mr. Alex. Inglis, treasurer of Glasgow, had calumniated him, entered his protest and resolved to seek remedy at law (B. 429).

From all that has been said, and from these last instruments, it seems reasonable to believe that the building on the north side of the cathedral was erected by Bishop Muirhead (1455-1473) when he formed the College of Vicars Choral, and that it was a hall for their use, for their business meetings and for their music practising. The following reasons seem to establish this view:

1. The vicars of the choir all dwelt on the north side of the cathedral. The precentor and the sub-precentor had their manses and gardens on the same side and joining those of the vicars. By this arrangement they could all easily and conveniently meet in this hall.

2. It was intended to be a two-storey building. A stair to lead to the second storey was seen when some repairs were made in this building in January, 1889. A sketch of this stair was made by Mr. William Kennedy, Clerk of Works, G. P. O. The repair in question was but the renewal, in

brickwork, of the arch supporting the modern stone roof. The position of the staircase was nearer the north-west angle than the south-west. The staircase, he informs me, was evidently in the thickness of the old wall, which had been faced outside at the time of the "restoration," when the building had been reduced in height from two storeys to one storey. The stair would probably be continued in the thickness of the wall to the level of the upper floor, so that the doorway from the staircase to the upper floor would be nearer the south-west angle than the north-west. The doorway to the lower floor can still be seen from the inside of the building. It is built up with rubble, as was also the staircase at the time of the repair in 1889; it had been filled with rubbish at the time of the "restoration."

The hall on the second storey may have been meant for the robing-room of the vicars, or it may have been used as the sleeping-place of the sacristan, who was required to sleep in the church (A. 410).

3. A song school and hall, where the vicars choral and the choir boys could meet for their rehearsals, would be required, and by this hall such a need would be supplied.

4. There were occasions when meetings on matters of business were to be held between the canons and the vicars choral. Some of these meetings were held in the chapter-house, and others in the hall of the vicars of the choir. That the latter building was suitable for the purpose is evident from the fact that its size was 36 feet long by 28 feet broad. In the cases quoted above we find that in two instances two canons sat in judgment in this hall; in the third instance, two canons sat to make an inquiry; and in the fifth case, three canons were present to receive a protest.

Nor can it be argued that such meetings could have been held in the dining hall of the vicars, because it would not have been a suitable room. For more private matters, meetings were sometimes held in the apartment of the vicar; *e.g.* an instrument, on the appointment by Sir Alex. Panter, vicar of the choir, of Sir G. Panter as his procurator, was drawn up *in camera sua in loco vicariorum de Glasgw* (B. 457).

5. To the above reasons for applying the term "the hall of the vicars

of the choir" to the building on the north side of the cathedral may be added that no other probable purpose or use for the building can be assigned.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE BY P. MACGREGOR CHALMERS, F.S.A.Scot.

The building measures internally about 32 feet long by 17 feet 6 inches broad, and the walls average about 4 feet 3 inches thick. On the west side the present stone-flagged roof springs from the top member of the moulded base. Most of the stones forming this base are modern. There was a staircase, 2 feet 3 inches wide, in the thickness of this wall, the west side of the opening from the interior being 10 feet 7 inches from the north end of the wall.[1] The stair is now built up, but seven steps were seen at the time of the recent restoration. The north gable is almost entirely modern, only a few old stones being discernible in the base course. The east wall is 4 feet 4 inches high above the base, but is also of modern work. The ground on this side has been at a low level originally, but probably owing to recent requirements in connection with the heating chamber the level has been lowered, and now the rough rubble foundations are exposed to a depth of about 2 feet 7½ inches. The floor in the interior is of earth, and the exposed faces of the west, north, and east walls are of rough rubble, and are evidently not the original work. The present vault is slightly pointed and is built of 9-inch brickwork. The building abuts against the north wall of the lower church of the cathedral where a part of the late twelfth-century structure is preserved. This wall is built of ashlar in level courses throughout. The base course, which is 6 inches deep and formed with a simple splay, is on one level, and returns round the two buttresses. The later base at the west end covers it in part, but the same simple splay appears alone on the gable of the north transept, and it is continued round the whole extent of the great nave as the bottom splay of the transitional base. The base is removed from sight at the east end, after its return round the buttress, by the brick building of the furnace

[1] Report to Archbishop Eyre, by Mr. Kennedy, Master of Works.

and the flue of the heating apparatus.[1] But there can be no doubt that it returns at the end of the great buttress which marks the end of the twelfth-century aisle.[2] An opening, 4 feet 3 inches wide, has been cut through the wall to give access to the lower church. It occurs at a point where there is a broad platt in the stair leading down from the nave. In making the cutting, part of the base course was removed. The opening is now filled up roughly with broken stone shivers and lime. There is a plain corbel projecting from the wall above this built-up opening. The line of the old stone vaulting is shown by the deep raggle cut in the face of the ashlar. The wall is about 1¼ inches off the plumb, leaning to the north, and the face of the masonwork above the raggle is set back ¾ of an inch at the west end and 2½ inches at the east end. The east buttress is carried up to the wallhead of the choir aisle, of uniform width and projection. It is the largest buttress in the choir. It has been repaired and altered considerably, chiefly in connection with the formation of a flue for the furnace. The west buttress, now the corner buttress of the north transept gable, was increased 12 inches in projection. The masonry of the face, up to and including the third course above the springing of the aisle window arch, has been renewed. When this work was executed it was intended, I think, to remove the low building, for an attempt was made to carry the later moulded and deeply-splayed base course completely round the buttress. A great part of the ashlar walling above the present stone-flagged roof is modern. Old stones have perhaps been used in parts, but in the centre, over the ridge, new stones with recent tooling have been used. The width of this entirely new work is about 4 feet 6 inches. The moulded string course and window sills are new. The two large mullions, with the exception of the two upper stones in each, are new. The lower parts of the side rybats are also new, as well as one or two of the stones in the window tracery. The new work is clearly discernible on the interior face of the wall in the choir aisle. The window sills, the two large

[1] I examined the work at the back of the furnace.

[2] This is at a point which corresponds with the east corner of the twelfth-century work in the south aisle of the lower church. The base on this south aisle is also on one level, and is about 15 inches below the level of the base on the north wall.

mullions, with the exception of the two upper stones, and the side rybats up to the level of the second course below the capitals are all new. The centre part of the stone bench table is also new. It is impossible to determine whether the opening in the wall under the window was a door, perhaps about 4 feet 6 inches wide, or a broad open archway. Some ornamental features, measuring about 6 inches across, originally projected beyond the face of the wall into the aisle, but these have been cut away. They may have been ornamental buttresses. As the total width over these projections was 10 feet, the door, if it was a door, was probably richly decorated.

The trend of all this evidence is perfectly clear. The low building has had a second storey originally, which communicated directly with the choir aisle. There must have been several steps in the thickness of the wall, as the aisle floor is about 2 feet 8 inches above the level of the floor of the second storey of the low building, as indicated by the raggle in the wall. The aisle window was originally very short, with the sills at different levels to suit the slope of the roof outside.

There can hardly be any doubt as to the date of this structure. It formed part of the great scheme of church building prepared by Bishop William de Bondington in the thirteenth century. The arrangement of the buttresses resembles that in the choir and chapter-house, and the base is of the same section as that on these buildings. Then the opening from the choir aisle and the design of the aisle window were manifestly of this date.

There is little to record regarding the later history of the building. It was thoroughly repaired and the brick vault erected during the months of January, February, and March, 1889. The stone vaulting and the stone roofing which was then removed had been erected so recently as 1850,[1] but so carelessly was the work done that it soon fell into ruin. The elevation was then as at present. This may be seen in the picture painted by Williams in 1854.[2] The gable of the north transept was repaired by the Government in 1846, and it was probably at this time

---

[1] *Glasgow Cathedral*, Dr. Gordon, p. 67.
[2] The property of A. H. Donald, Esq.

that the total destruction of this building was contemplated.[1] In a publication issued in 1836, showing the plans and elevations of the proposed restorations and additions to the Cathedral of Glasgow, it is remarked, on page 6, that "the unsightly building which projects from the north-west end of the choir, a little to the east of where the north transept ought to be, was not a transept, but a dormitory for the monks engaged in the nightly services of the cathedral." In *Plans, Elevations, etc., of the Cathedral of Glasgow*, published by Mr. J. Collie in 1835, plate viii., is a view of the north side of the cathedral. This low building is shown two storeys in height. The choir aisle window is shown with the short lower lights as already described, and the sills rise immediately above the slopes of the roof. The end gable, which had no window, was finished at the top with plain square crow-steps. There was a large square-headed door in the basement. The reference in the text, on page 5, is—"The low building on the left of the transept is the gable of the dormitory; it is now used as a burial vault." In a book called *Glasgow Illustrated*, by Mr. J. Cullan, illustrated by Mr. J. Scott, and published in 1834, the north-east view of the cathedral shows this low building as in Collie's drawing. Mr. Archibald M'Lellan, in his *Essay on the Cathedral Church of Glasgow*, published in 1833, says on pp. 35, 36: "In the year 1233 William de Bondington was consecrated to the See, by Andrew, bishop of Murray. He is stated to have enlarged the cathedral, and perfected the work of his predecessors. What portions of the present fabric are of this prelate's erection it is not easy to say; probably the north-western tower and the consistory house, for whom no claimants have hitherto appeared, or that nondescript building, which projects its unsightly form northwards from the west end of the choir." On page 63 he adds: "The ruinous fabric on the east side of the north transept is believed to have been a dormitory. It was once a storey higher than it is now; when that storey was removed it is to be regretted that the building was not taken down altogether." It is possible that this statement is founded on one of the earliest engravings of the cathedral—a view from the north-east—"engraved

[1] The consistory house was taken down in 1846, and the north-western tower in 1848.

in the Academy in Glasgow by R. Paul Eleve," in which the north wall of this low building is shown in ruins and lacking the gable top. The wall-head is certainly shown higher than in Collie's drawing, but the engraving is not accurate in every particular, and it will be noticed that the aisle window of the choir is shown of the full length, as at present. When the lower church of the cathedral was abandoned by the Barony Church in 1801[1] it was used as a public burying-place. This low building was used for the same purpose. The monument in the interior against the east wall is dated 1809. That on the west end of the south wall partly covers the old opening, and shows that the opening was built up before 1832, the date on the tomb.

It is clear, from Collie's drawing, that the upper part of the north gable, with its simple crow-steps, was not erected in the thirteenth century. It is possible that the building, which doubtless had a timber roof, was restored about the beginning of the seventeenth century. There are many references to works of repair at the cathedral at this time in the *Records of the Burgh of Glasgow*. The upper part of the south-west tower—the consistory house, or library house—was built and repaired in 1628,[2] and the drawings which have been preserved of this picturesque building show that it was of the same character as the upper storey of this low building.

Whilst there is no absolute evidence on the point, it may be safely assumed that this low building was completed in mediaeval times. As we know that the chapter-house and sacristy at the north-east corner of the cathedral were not finished until after the middle of the fifteenth century,[3] it is possible that this building was used as a chapter-house and sacristy for nearly two hundred years. It may then have passed to the vicars of the choir who were founded into a college by Bishop Andrew Muirhead about the year 1455.

---

[1] *Glasgow Cathedral*, Dr. Gordon, p. 67.

[2] P. 365. It should not be forgotten that the Bishop gave vj^{c}lxvj li. xiijs. iiijd. "to help to repair the liberarie hous." P. 478. Many parts of the cathedral are referred to by name, but I can find no special reference to this low building. The records are awanting from 28th August, 1613, to 30th September, 1623.

[3] Bishop Turnbull's arms are carved near the wall-head. He died 3rd September, 1454. *Reg. Epi. Glas.*, pref., xlviii.

No. III.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE "KINGIS QUAIR."

BY

J. T. T. BROWN.

[*Read at a Meeting of the Society held on 19th March, 1896.*]

AMONG the manuscripts bequeathed to the Bodleian Library by John Selden, there is one well known by its catalogue reference, *Arch. Seld.*, B. 24. That it was written in the latter half of the fifteenth century by Scottish scribes does not admit of any doubt: on some other points, however, it preserves, like many another ancient document, a solemn silence when we would most wish to ask it questions. No colophon tells us who the compilers were, or where they dwelt; whether they made it as a private copy, for a church library, or for some rich book collector: and unfortunately there is no memorandum by Selden himself informing us when or through what channel it came into his possession. Its great interest for students of early Scottish poetry is that it contains the unique exemplar of the *Kingis Quair*.

How that poem was discovered, or rather rediscovered, in last century may be here briefly told.

In the *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica*, published in 1748, edited by Bishop Tanner of St. Asaph, *voce* Jacobus Stuartus Primus Scotiae Rex, a poem attributed to that king was noted as occurring in the Seldenian manuscript. Although rather infelicitously described as "a Lament made while the King was in England," the citation of the opening line—

"Heigh in the hevynnis figure circulere,"

and the explicit statement that "at the end of the poem the author highly

praises Gower and Chaucer," showed plainly enough that it had been seen by the writer of the notice.[1]

Some years later the curiosity of at least one literary Scotsman was aroused by the announcement. Mr. William Tytler, father of Lord Woodhouselee and grandfather of Patrick Fraser Tytler, the historian, after several fruitless attempts to trace the manuscript, obtained in the end a transcript of the poem, and, having edited it, printed the complete text in 1783. The volume in which it appeared, entitled *Poetical Remains of King James the First*,[2] was published anonymously, but Tytler, it is well known, was the editor. In the "Historical and Critical Dissertation" the poem is unhesitatingly ascribed to James.

Tytler's decision need excite no surprise now, if only we attempt to put ourselves in his place and look at the subject from his standpoint. Like every literary man of the time, he believed James the First to be entitled to high rank among the national poets, the testimony of John Major concerning the poetical talents of the king being then questioned by none. The poem, *Christ's Kirk on the Green*, was regarded by many persons—Tytler among the number—as one of the royal compositions.[3] But the *Kingis Quair* came with far better credentials. In the Bodleian manuscript, and in Bishop Tanner's catalogue, Tytler found James named as the author, while the theme of the poem doubtless seemed to him to agree in every particular with "the little book about the queen" mentioned by Major as having been written by James while a captive in England.

Further, it is necessary to make due allowance for the apparatus-criticus

---

[1] Jacobus Stuartus I. rex Scotiae (Dempst. 380: Bal. par. post 217). In fine poematis lamentatio Gowerum et Chaucerum mirifice laudat. Scripsit leges aequissimas, lib. 1: Super uxore futura, lib. 1: Cantilenas Scoticas, lib. 1; (Lamentatio facta dum in Anglia fuit rex. Pr. "Heigh in the hevyns figure circulare." MS. bibl. Bodl. Selden, Archiv. B 24.) Rhythmos Latinos, lib. 1; De musica, lib. 1.

[2] Edinburgh, printed for J. and E. Balfour, 1783.

[3] Its popularity is attested by Pope's couplet:

> "One likes no language but the Faery Queen,
> A Scot will fight for Christ's Kirk o' the Green."

of a century ago. The critical study of early English poetry had scarcely then commenced. To have decided other than the way he did, Tytler would have required to know more than any of his contemporaries, and to have discovered for himself much that has only become known to ourselves by the combined labours of distinguished philologists and critics who have made Middle English a special study. As it was, he came very near the truth—nearer, as we shall see, than any of the subsequent editors—so near, indeed, that one may well believe he would have decided the question of the authorship differently had he been editing the poem in the light of the fuller knowledge of our day. But be that as it may, his decision was given for James, and to the present hour has been regarded as final and conclusive.

The result of a new study of the poem has led me to doubt the orthodox belief, and, in consequence, to ask for a reconsideration of the whole case. And as the doubt strikes at the conclusions of all the editors, and, not least, at those of the latest editor, it seems for that reason specially desirable, in considering the question *de novo*, to make the Scottish Text Society edition the basis of our criticism, the claim for James being therein set forth and restated by Professor Skeat with all the weight and authority of his *imprimatur*. At the same time, to ensure a fair trial, our standpoint must be that of the first editor rather than that of the latest.. In other words, we must, as far as possible, view the question in all its bearings, precisely as one would require to do were the *Kingis Quair* being edited now for the first time—beginning, as it were at the foundations, and only after comparison, information, and previous examination of all the evidence, both external and internal, attempting to reach a conclusion. This infers necessarily that salient facts will be kept in the foreground, and historical facts interpreted legitimately.

In stating the argument as it stands in my own mind, I propose to deal first with the Historical or External evidence, viz. (*a*) the Bodleian Manuscript, and (*b*) the Testimony of Historians; and, second, with the Internal evidence, viz. (*a*) the Dialect, (*b*) the Court of Love, and (*c*) the Autobiography in the poem.

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

(*a*) THE BODLEIAN MS.—ARCH. SELD. B. 24.

The manuscript may be described as a poetical miscellany containing poems of Chaucer, Hoccleve, Lydgate, and other known and unknown authors.[1] It is written on paper, and extends to 231 folios, several having ornamental borders and capitals. On folio 120, immediately following one of the poems, and written in the same hand, there occurs this memorandum: "Nativitas principis nostri Jacobi quarti anno D^ni^ M^mo^ iiij^c^ lxxij^o^ xvij die mensis marcii videlicet in festo sancti Patricii confessoris, In monasterio sancte crucis prope Edinburgh,"—a note which Professor Skeat evidently saw but hastily interpreted. He says, "On leaf 120 of the MS. the date 1472 occurs; and the date of the MS. itself is about 1475, or half a century after the date of composition of the poem."[2] A little care would have shown that it is only a clerk's record of the king's birthday which could not have been written before 1488, when James ascended the throne as "the Fourth."[3] Both 1472 and 1475 may be dismissed therefore as manifest blunders.

The *Kingis Quair* begins on folio 191 and ends on 211. Two scribes have been at the copying of it, the one completing the first 178 stanzas, the other the concluding 19 stanzas. The memorandum unquestionably establishes 1488 as the earliest possible date of the manuscript, when it had only been completed as far as folio 120; and it is pretty safe to say that when the *Kingis Quair* came to be transcribed at folio 191, some considerable period of time had in all probability elapsed.

---

[1] *Vide* note A, App. p. 145.

[2] Introd. *Kingis Quair*, p. xxxvii.

[3] On 22nd November, 1895, the Rev. W. D. Macray, of the Bodleian Library, kindly sent me a copy of the memorandum, pointing out at the same time that it had "wrongly been assumed to be the actual date of the MS., whereas it must have been written after the accession of James as 'IV.'" The transcript of the MS. printed in the Appendix, I obtained on 12th December. I subsequently discovered that Dr. David Laing had noted and printed the memorandum. *Vide Bann. Miscel.*, Vol. II., p. 161.

Be that as it may, so far as we are at present able to judge, it appears to be possible to date it only approximately by the regnal year, 1488.

The title given to the *Kingis Quair* is as follows: "Heireefter followis the quair Maid be[1] King James of scotland ye first, callit ye Kingis quair, and Maid quhen his Ma. wes in Ingland," the colophon being, "Explicit, &c., &c., &c., quod Jacobus primus scotorum rex Illustrissimus." It is almost unnecessary to point out that that must be an ascription and not the original title of the poem. James, we may be certain, did not so write about himself. So, too, the writer of the last nineteen stanzas followed only a common style of colophon, and one which was simply a corollary of the ascription itself, when he added, "quod Jacobus primus scotorum rex Illustrissimus."

Now, it may be admitted (1) that both title and colophon designate James the First as the author of the poem, and (2) that such an ascription occurring in a manuscript is in general deserving of some regard. At most, however, it is only *prima facie* evidence, liable to challenge on many grounds on good cause shown, and so the value of this ascription must depend on the reliability of the anonymous scribes.

Fortunately, as it happens, we are able to test their accuracy. When the manuscript is examined, this is what is found. Many poems ascribed to Chaucer are not his at all. Hoccleve's *Mother of God* has the misleading remark, "explicit oracio Galfridi Chaucere."[2] Another poem beginning "deuise prowes and eke humylitee," has the colophon, "quod Chaucer quhen he was rycht auisit," a good comment on which is that the scribe was himself quite "wrongly advised, for it is plainly not Chaucer's at all."[3] A verse, the first line of which is "Richt as pouert causith sobirness," has also the "quod Chaucere." Frequently printed under the title *Prosperity*, as a genuine Chaucerian composition,

---

[1] A very pertinent query is put to me by my friend, Professor W. S. M'Cormick, of St. Andrews, viz. whether this *be* may not rather mean *concerning* than *by*: *vide* Kellner's *Hist. Outlines of Eng. Syntax*, pp. 273-275; Skeat's *Glossary* (Chaucer, *Leg.* 271, *H.F.* 286, etc., etc.).

[2] *Vide* note A, App., and also the *Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Library edition, Clarendon Press), Vol. I., p. 47.

[3] *Id.* p. 47.

it was at last properly rejected on internal evidence by Professor Skeat. In his edition of Chaucer, recently issued from the Clarendon Press, he says, "I have no belief in the genuineness of the piece, though it is not ill written. In general the ascription of a piece to Chaucer in a MS. is valuable. But the scribe of this particular manuscript was reckless."[1] And a little further on, commenting on another poem often printed as one of Chaucer's, with the title *Leaulte vault Richesse*, he says, "if I could be sure that the lines were by a well-known author, I should at once ascribe them to King James I., who might very well have written these and the lines called *Prosperity*."[2] Within the past few weeks, however, the poem *Prosperity* has been identified as part of the prologue written by John Walton to his translation of Boethius' *de Consolatione*, a popular book in the fifteenth century.[3] Luckily, as we have seen, Professor Skeat just stopped short of ascribing the lines to James the First, but the identification of Walton as the author accumulates the evidence against the manuscript. Lydgate's *Complaynt of the Black Knight* is also falsely ascribed thus—"Here endith the Maying and Disporte of Chaucere"; and besides those I have mentioned, there are two other poems mistakenly attributed to the same poet, viz. one beginning, "O hie Emperice and quene celestial," and *The Cuckoo and the Nightingale*. The grand result is that out of twelve poems five are correctly attributed to Chaucer, five wrongly. The two remaining are the *Kingis Quair*, now on its trial, and the *Quair of Jelusy*, the colophon of the latter being mutilated,[4] so rendering impossible its classification either among the sheep or the goats.

It is manifest, therefore, that however valuable the volume may be

---

[1] *Vide* note A, App., and also the *Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Library edition, Clarendon Press), Vol. I., pp. 47, 54.

[2] *Id.* 48, 54. Professor Skeat ends his comment on the worthlessness of the ascriptions with these words: "It is somewhat of a coincidence that the very MS. here discussed is that in which the unique copy of the *Kingis Quair* is preserved."

[3] *Athenæum*, 28th December, 1895.

[4] The colophon is "quod Auche. . . ." It is supposed to be by "James Affleck," mentioned in *The Lament for the Makars*. The name Auchinleck is, of course, pronounced Affleck. The poem consists of 607 lines. *Vide* Note C, App. p. 81.

for the text of early poems, it is practically untrustworthy on the very point on which we are questioning it. The many false ascriptions show the scribes to have been most reckless, and prove them without doubt to be unreliable, if not altogether incredible, witnesses for King James. So much for the manuscript. Let us hear now what is the testimony of the historians.

(*b*) THE TESTIMONY OF HISTORIANS.

For our present purpose only the statements relating to the personal accomplishments, or, in chroniclers' phrase, the "princely virtues" of James the First require to be considered. In collecting the evidence, we begin with the *Scotichronicon* of Walter Bower, the one contemporary history of the reign of James. Bower's memoir of the king (*de descriptione et virtutibus ejus*) runs through no fewer than eleven chapters (B. XVI., cc. 28 to 38). Though it reads now like a funeral oration, one nevertheless feels it to be a carefully executed portrait from the life. James, it tells us, was of medium stature—a little under the average—but big-boned and powerful. As an athlete he excelled in putting the stone, throwing the hammer (*optimus iactor et mallei projector*), and wrestling (*ad colluctandum*). None could handle a bow better (*optimus arcitenens*) or was more skilful in the tilting ring (*hastiludiator gnarus*). He was so fleet that he seemed to have wings to his feet (*tanquam alipes velocissimus cursor*). He was besides an intrepid horseman and traveller (*eques strenuissimus et viator*).

We are then told at great length about the king's attainments as a musician. He had a fine voice; could play the organ, psaltery, flute, lyre, drum, and trumpet with masterly perfection (*ad summae perfectionis magisterium*). On the harp he performed like another Orpheus (*tanquam alterum Orpheum*). He was a composer, and had a perfect knowledge of the laws of regular melody and of the art of expressing by notation the ballad music of his country. But his leisure was not wholly given to music. The hours of each day were carefully apportioned. When the cares of his kingdom permitted, he would retire—now for the study of literary art

and for writing (*operi artis literatoriae et scripturae*);[1] now for drawing and painting (*protractioni et picturae*); at other times employing himself in the garden or orchard, planting and engrafting; and in all honest sports and recreations that could enliven the spirits of his followers (*ad refocillandum suorum sequacium animos*). As if all that were not enough, we are next told that the royal dignity did not deter James from engaging on occasion in certain mechanical pursuits—pursuits that dire necessity alone compels the noble-born to work at; and then the minutely particular portrait is completed with an allusion to his extraordinary love of book-knowledge (*incredibili aestu, amabat scientiam scripturarum*), and a high tribute to his prudence, justice, fairness, clemency, and reforming zeal. The chronicler is precise in stating that James's accomplishments were acquired during his captivity in England.[2]

Next in point of time comes John Major, whose *History of Greater Britain*, written while the author was a professor in the Sorbonne, was published at Paris in 1521. The royal portrait is as follows: "Our James was, if we may trust the chroniclers, short of stature but robust and stout of body.[3] . . . He was a man of the finest natural gifts, and of a very lofty spirit. He took, in all manly exercises, a foremost part: farther than any he could put the large stone or throw the heavy hammer swift he was of foot; a well-skilled musician; as a singer second to none. With the harp like another Orpheus he surpassed the Irish or the Wild Scots who are in that art pre-eminent. It was in the time of his long captivity in France and England that he learned all these accomplishments."

Up to this point Major keeps close to the *Scotichronicon*: he proceeds, however, to add something of his own, and as the passage is all-important in the present inquiry it will be proper here to translate it quite literally.

---

[1] I have preferred to translate the words literally: Bellenden (*vide* p. 13 *infra*) rendered them as "grammar and oratory." *Vide* also *Facciolatus voce litteratorius.*

[2] "All these items in his training were duly charged in his ransom money, £40,000 stg." (*Hist. of England under Henry IV.*, by James Hamilton Wylie, Vol. II., ch. 61). Tytler could not resist making the same jocular remark.

[3] Major here quotes Aeneas Sylvius' well-known description of James.

It runs thus:[1] "In the vernacular he was a most skilful composer. Many of his written pieces and songs, remembered still, are by the Scots esteemed among the best. He wrote a clever little book about the Queen before he took her to wife, and while he was a prisoner (as well as another clever little song of a like kind, *Yas Sen*, etc.; and that merry and clever piece, *At Beltayn*, etc., which certain persons of Dalkeith and Gargeil have tried to alter), for he was kept immured in the castle—or a chamber of it—where the maiden dwelt with her mother."[2]

Five years later, in 1526, there was published at Paris *The History of Scotland*, written by Hector Boyes. The sketch of James, found scattered through several chapters, is manifestly a compilation from Bower, Major, and Aeneas Sylvius, with a few original touches, for which doubtless the unrivalled imagination of the historian was the sole authority.[3]

Boyes had the good fortune to have his *History* translated into Scottish by John Bellenden in 1536. It is well known, however, that the translator

---

[1] "In vernacula lingua artificiosissimus compositor: cujus codices plurimi et cantilenae memoriter adhuc apud Scotos inter primos habentur. Artificiosum libellum de Regina dum captivus erat composuit, anteq. eam in conjugem duceret: et aliam artificiosam cantilenam ejusdem. Yas sen etc. et jucundum artificiosumq: illum cantum: at beltayn etc. quem alii de Dalketh et Gargeil, mutare studuerunt: quia in arce aut camera clausus seruabatur in qua mulier cum matre habitabat."—Major, Lib. VI., cap. xiiii., fol. cxxxv. Paris, 1521. In the Latin text I follow the original punctuation.

[2] Compare with Mr. Constable's translation: *vide* note B, App. p. 78.

[3] "Ense cum altero dimicare et hasta ad unguem certare sic callebat, ut sic luctantem vidisses, athletam dixisses, etc. . . . Jam vero humaniores artes grammaticam oratoriam poeticamq. ut tum temporis eximie nouerat. In lingua vernacula tam ornata faciebat carmina, ut poetam natum credisses. Latine vero ut tum mos erat, temporis iniuria incondita quidem, attamen grauissimis referta sententiis conficiebat, ut facile appareret si meliores adhibiti preceptores fuissent qualis euasurus tum fuisset. . . . Physices ante arcana cuncta comperta habebat. Theologiam ac jus sic, ut nulli cederet. Ea omnia octodecim annis quibus in Anglia captus erat." etc.—Lib. XVI., fol. ccliii.

"Vir fuit Jacobus dum in vivis esset, mediae staturae latissimis humeris, constrictissimis lateribus, veluti puellarum esse consuerunt, clunibus ac pedibus pro corporis habitu moderatis. Unde quidam eum quadratum dixere vera videlicet vocis significatione qua optimi corporis habitus temperaturque indicatur. Praeter eas animi virtutes, quas superius commemoravimus, inter primos justitiae fuit cultor atque injuriarum acerrimus vindex. Nullis superiorum regum pacis muneribus inferior, plurimos etiam superans."—Boethius, *Scotorum Historiae*, Lib. XVII., fol. ccclxvii. Paris, 1526.

took considerable liberties with his original, and the passage relating to James is one of many examples. His models appear to have been chiefly Bower and Major rather than Boyes. This is the substituted portrait: "Yit be benevolence of King Hary, war chosin sa wise and expert praeceptouris to instruk him in virtew and science; that he was na les resolute in every science, than he had bene perpetually occupyit bot in ane: for he wes weill leirnit to fecht with the swerd, to just, to turnay, to worsill, to sing and dance:[1] and was ane expert medicinar: richt crafty in playing baith of lute and harp and sindry othir instrumentis of musik. He was expert in gramer oratry[2] and poetry: and maid sa flowand and sententious versis that appeirit weill he was ane naturall borne poete. He was als ane cunning theolog. For he lernit all his science during the time of his captivite."

Forty-two years later another historian appeared, John Leslie, Bishop of Ross. His *History of Scotland*, published at Rome in 1578, was, eighteen years later, translated into Scottish by Father James Dalrymple. The translation, besides being faithful, is a specimen of sixteenth century prose.[3] James, he says, "was of midway stature, brade schoudert, and the rest of his memberis equal with this forme. When Aeneas Sylvius wald expreme the conjunction of his memberis with the majestie of his persoune, he calls him squair; as he wald say, his memberis war of sik equalitie that Nature culde forme nathing mare decent to the decore of a king, ather mair perfyt til a Kingis majestie. . . . Althoch he obteynet throuch benifite of nature sum commend of thir vertues, yit speciallie throuch the discipline of the zeris quhen he was captive in Ingland, throuch the kingis favour and gud wil, he was sa weil instructed, and diligent kair of his maistir; and in all sciences was sa scientive and cunning that in quhat science he was cunningest culd na mantel. In

[1] Dancing, medicine, and theology are Boyes's contribution transmitted through Bellenden.

[2] *Vide* note "literatoriae," *supra*.

[3] *The Historie of Scotland* by Johne Leslie, Bishop of Ross, and translated in Scottish by Father James Dalrymple, Religious in the Scottis Cloister of Regensburg, 1596. (Scot. Text Society Edition.)

al kynde of musik he was excellent, upon the cythar mervellous, in oratrie nane mare artificious: in poetrie that he usit nocht only throuch arte to compond verse, but naturallie in a maner to speik verses. This will testifie the dyverse kyndes quhilkes he maid in Scotis metre, sa cunninglie, sa artificiouslie, and sa prudentlie that he was thocht verilie equal in quiknes, gravitie, and prudencie to the alde poetes of antiquite. Appeiris wounderful heir quhat we speik and sik diligence far to excel the diligence of kings in our aige and skairs possible to believe. But quhen it was verilie trew and confirmit be thame quha spak with him, war familiar with him and quha perfytlie knew him, suld be writne to his perpetual prayse."[1]

And last in the procession comes George Buchanan, whose *History of Scotland* was published in 1581. His portrait of James is as follows: "In stature he was rather below middle size, yet so firm and robust that he easily excelled all his contemporaries in exercises where strength and agility were required; and such the quickness and vigour of his mind that he was ignorant of no art becoming a gentleman to know. He made rough Latin verses extempore, as was the practice of that age. Some poems written by him in the English language are yet extant, in which the excellence of his genius is displayed, though perhaps we might ask for more polish in the execution. In music he was more exquisitely skilled than was either necessary or expedient in a king, for there was no instrument but he could touch with such science that he might have contended with the greatest masters of his day."[2]

---

[1] The part of the original which particularly relates to the main question is as follows: "praeterquam enim quod musicae omnis generis, ac in primis cythare pulsande exquisitissimam rationem tenebat: ita orator erat, ut ejus dictione nihil fuerit artificiosius: ita poeta, ut carmina non tam arte astrinxisse, quam natura sponte fudisse videretur. Cui rei fidem faciunt carmina diversi generis, que in rythmum Scotice illigauit, eo artificio, ut antiquorum poetarum acumen, gravitatem prudentia plane putetur aequasse." — Leslie, *De Origine*, Book VII., p. 277. Rome, 1578.

[2] Carmina latina, ut illud erat seculum, rudia ex tempore fundebat. Anglico quidem sermone poemata ab eo conscripta nonnulla adhuc extant: in quibus ingenii praestantia elucet, expolitior doctrina fortasse requiramur. Geo. Buchanan, *Hist. of Scotland: Opera omnia.* It is perhaps deserving of notice that Montaigne, who was Buchanan's pupil, had a like opinion about certain kingly accomplishments—"more proper for a woman,

When these passages are read together, it becomes clear that we are not dealing with six independent witnesses. The *Scotichronicon* is substantially the original. Major and Boyes unquestionably derived their information from it, each appropriating just so much as suited himself. When Bellenden came to write his paraphrase of Boyes he had, besides the *Scotichronicon*, John Major's history to draw from. It is doubtful, however, if he used Major in writing the "character" of the king, for it may be the "sententious versis" referred to by him are the Latin verses said to have been extemporized by James—preserved in the *Scotichronicon*, and evidently deemed unworthy of special mention in the eulogy.[1] But in the case of Leslie and Buchanan it is different. That they compiled from Major, Boyes, and Bellenden, as well as from Bower, is well known. Leslie's investigation of facts, however, goes for little; and whatever else in his narrative may be true, it is certain that his statement about "dyvers versis made in Scotis" by James cannot be accepted as "verilie trew and confirmit be thame quha spak with him, war familiar with him and quha perfytlie knew him," resting as it does on the testimony of John Major alone. With Buchanan it is different. Not only does he mention "some poems still extant," he also speaks of them as somewhat lacking in "polish"—a criticism to be expected from one with his classical predilections, and more especially if we might suppose him to be expressing an opinion about a poem like *Peebles to the Play*. We must therefore hold that he was able to identify the poems in Major's list—or one or more of them—as we ourselves can do now, and, further, that he took the

---

an advocate, or a sponge, than for a king. . . . Plutarch says that for a king to appear as excellent in these less necessary qualities, is to produce witness against a man's self that he has spent his time and applied his study ill, which ought to have been employed in the acquisition of useful things.—"On Cicero," *Essays*, Vol. I.

[1] *Scotichronicon*, Lib. XVI., ch. 15, "Interim dum sic ista se haberent, rex metrificavit, dicens suis astantibus—

'Ad turrim fortem ducamus caute cohortem
Per Christi sortem, meruerunt hi quia mortem.'"

Major the professor peeps out frequently in his History. He comments on James's false quantity thus:—"Ultimam adverbii *caute* longam breviabat: sed regibus sic ex tempore componentibus danda est venia."

trouble to do so. But in accepting his literary criticism, we must take care not to give it a value which it does not possess. It certainly does not strengthen Major's statement in the least degree, and we require to fall back on the *History of Greater Britain* as the sole authority for the ascription to James of the vernacular poems.

Before proceeding to examine the passage in Major, let us note here the remarkable fact that neither Dunbar nor Lindsay seems to have known James the First to be among the poets. In the *Lament of the Makars*, printed in 1508, Dunbar enumerates twenty-one Scottish poets—Sir Hew of Eglinton, Heryot, Wyntown, John Clerk, James Affleck, Holland, Barbour, Sir Mungo Lockhart, Clerk of Tranent, Sir Gilbert Hay, Blynd Harry, Sandy Traill, Patrick Johnstoun, Merseir, Roull of Aberdeen, Roull of Corstorphine, Henrysoun, Sir John the Ross, Stobo, Quintin Schaw, and Walter Kennedy—all of them dead when the poem was written except Kennedy, who is spoken of as then lying at death's door. Considering Dunbar's wide knowledge of native poetry, and the theme of the *Lament*, the omission of the name of James the First from that roll of fame is surely most significant. If he was a makar, his name alone is needed to render the catalogue complete.[1] Courtier-poet as Dunbar was, who can doubt that he would have been glad of any opportunity of including the name of the great-grandfather of his royal master? Less than a quarter of a century later, we find Sir David Lindsay addressing James the Fifth as "of flowand rhetorick the Flour"—a complimentary allusion to the royal poetic gifts. So, too, in the *Testament and Complaynt*, published about 1527, eight poets of a former time are named—Holland, Hay, Rowle, Henrysoun, Dunbar, Merseir, Kennedy, and Schaw—but no mention is made of James the First. In a question like the one we are

[1] Dr. David Laing refers, it is true, to the omission of Thomas of Ercildoune, but I agree with Mr. George P. M'Neill (*vide* Huchown of the Awle Ryale, *Scot. Review*, Vol. XIV.) that the "testimony of modern research is plainly destructive of the Rhymer's claim to be regarded as a Scottish poet. The bubble reputation of the poet of Ercildoune is but a thin film of fact blown into large and lovely roundness by the airy imaginations of the popular fancy of earlier and the poetic spirits of later times. It was not strong enough to contain all the claims with which successive enthusiasts filled it, and it was in real danger of bursting into nothing."

discussing, such silence on the part of poets like Dunbar and Lindsay is surely much more than a negative argument.[1]

But to return to the passage in Major. It is needless to conjecture where he, a sixteenth century historian, obtained his information. When his *History* appeared, James the First had been dead for eighty-four years. But by the particular specification of the vernacular poems, we are able to test, at least to some extent, the accuracy of the statement. His reference to "the little book about the Queen," we may consider to mean the *Kingis Quair*. We shall see immediately how that poem stands the test of criticism. Attempts at identification of the sprightly little song, *Yas sen*, have been frequently made. Pinkerton suggested a song beginning—

"Sen that eyne that workis my weilfair,"

and proposed to amend the line by reading—

"Yas, sen that the eyne that workis my weilfair,"[2]

supposing his foundling to have been mutilated by some scribe; while Ritson, on the ground that there are many typographical errors in Major's *History*, proposed that for the words, *Yas sen*, we should read *Sen yat*. When the song itself has been discovered, it may be possible to decide the question of the authorship; at present no judgment is possible one way or another.

The other poem, *At Beltayn*, was long ago identified as *Peebles to the Play*, the first line of which is,

"At Beltayn, quhen ilk bodie bownis,"

---

[1] Lindsay, it may be noted, knew *Peebles to the Play*, for in his *Interlude of Humanitie and Sensualitie* he makes Solace mention—

"My purchess is not worth ane prene,
I may sing Peebles on the Grene."

I might also have cited James VI. as a witness against his ancestor. He wrote verses, and prayed

"Goddis, grant I may obteine the Laurall trie."

He was, besides, the author of *Reulis and Cautelis to be obseruit and eschewit in Scottis Poesie*, but he never once alludes to James I. or quotes a line of his poetry in the many examples he gives from them "that wrait of auld."

[2] Sibbald's *Chronicles of Scottish Poetry*, Vol. I., p. 55; and Irving's *History of Scottish Poetry*, p. 153.

and until comparatively recent times the royal authorship was scarcely questioned.[1] Modern criticism, however, has reversed the verdict, and it is scarcely necessary now to adduce proof against James's claims to the authorship. Professor Skeat is in perfect accord with all the best authorities when he says, "the moment we come to examine the poem, the notion of attributing it to James the First is entirely out of the question."[2] The same critic, laying stress on the fact that Major did not write till the sixteenth century, adds that "his testimony is almost worthless at best, the only surprising thing being that he is right as to the *Kingis Quair* itself. . . . The question of the authorship has been discussed *ad nauseam*, but the internal evidence ought to decide the question."[2]

With that criticism as to the value of Major's testimony most persons will concur—a criticism, let it be noted, which also concedes that the internal evidence alone, the pure reason of the case, must decide the authorship of the *Kingis Quair*.

THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

(*a*) THE DIALECT OF THE POEM.

HAVING reached the second branch of our inquiry, it is important, in considering the internal evidence, to have certain biographical facts about the supposed author always before us. For the particular question to be discussed, the salient facts are—(1) that James when taken prisoner by the English in 1406 was in the twelfth year of his age, (2) that his captivity

---

[1] Dr. Percy, the modern discoverer of *Peebles to the Play*, happening to remark that it began with the same two words, immediately pronounced it to be the song ascribed by Major to James I., and it was soon after published by Pinkerton as such. Mr. William Tytler concurred, chiefly "because the language resembles that of *Christ's Kirk on the Green*"; Pinkerton, on the other hand, accepted *Christ's Kirk on the Green* "because the style is similar to *Peebles to the Play*!" Sibbald, a far more acute critic, disbelieved in both poems. Ritson accepted *Peebles to the Play*, *vide* Sibbald, note, p. 137, and Pinkerton's *Select Scottish Ballads*, Vol. II.

[2] Introd., p. xx.

lasted till 1424, a period of about eighteen years, and (3) that he was educated in England in a manner which left nothing to be desired.

When the poem is read carefully, two things clearly appear. The first is, that the dialect employed from beginning to end is the Northern—the speech that prevailed throughout the Lowlands of Scotland. The second is, that the author has engrafted on that dialect many Chaucerian inflexions—inflexions peculiar to the Midland English but quite foreign to the Lowland Scottish dialect—the result being that he has produced a poem in what has been called "a purely artificial dialect, such as probably was never spoken."[1]

In noting some of those Midland grammatical forms, one has the advantage of having Professor Skeat as guide. He observes that there are many examples of (1) the artificial suffix *e* or *en*, as in words like changë, deseruë lettë, wirken, seken, trusten, helpen, etc.—a suffix quite unknown in Lowland Scottish; (2) words monosyllabic in Lowland Scottish made dissyllabic as in Chaucer, like hertë, pryncë, eyë, wisë, chargë, etc.; (3) the plural of adjectives and also the definite form of adjectives denoted, as in Chaucer, by a final *e*, in words like grenë, fairë, freschë; his fairë, that freschë, the suetë grenë. Further, he observes that the rimes are Northern rimes throughout, and that words are rimed together which Chaucer never admitted.[2]

Now in this extensive imitation the Scottish author has blundered frequently. His use of certain forms is neither Chaucerian nor Lowland Scottish. As regards his marking adjectives with a final *e*, let us hear Professor Skeat's criticism. He says, "But here comes in a most curious result. Chaucer does *not* in general use the final *e* in adjectives occurring in the singular and indefinitely. This is a refinement of grammar to which James did not attain. It is the fate of writers in an artificial dialect that

---

[1] Introd., *Kingis Quair*, p. xxv. While recognising some force in the grounds assigned for this opinion of Professor Skeat, I am far from being completely convinced. It seems to me that the artificiality is very much overstated.

[2] Introd., p. xxv. *et seq.* "The rimes are, I believe, Northern rimes throughout, and mostly only single rimes after the Northern fashion of ignoring the final *e*. We find words rimed together which Chaucer never admitted."—*Id.* xxxiv.

they make mistakes of this character, just as Spenser has perpetrated some extraordinary offences against grammatical propriety in his *Fairy Queen*. Accordingly we find the king wrongly adding a final *e* to indefinite adjectives in several places: he seems to have regarded it as a poetical embellishment to be added or dropped at pleasure, a theory which had doubtless great practical convenience. . . . The worst example of a false concord occurs in the first line of stanza 117, 'and quhen I wepe and *stenten* othir quhile.' It will be observed that the form *stenten* is absolutely required for the scansion: yet it is a *plural* form, just as if we should use the expression *ego amamus* in writing Latin. Yet it is quite explicable: it is a translation in Chaucerian language of the Northern word *styntis*, for in the Northern dialect the phrases *I stintis* and *we stintis* were once equally correct."

Professor Skeat tells us he was startled when he found the author of the *Kingis Quair* abandoning the grammar used in the Lowlands of Scotland, and attempting so much to imitate the midland inflexions of Chaucer, because it rendered the poem by no means what it had been supposed to be—an example of Northern dialect.[1] Now it appears to me that the grammatical analysis would have startled him in quite another way than the one it did had he been careful to take his bearings. But starting with the *a priori* assumption of James being the author of the poem, he misled himself, and failed besides to reap the reward of his critical labours on the text.

Let us consider the question of the dialect of the poem in the light of the biographical facts. First of all the dialect of the poem is in its groundwork unquestionably Lowland Scottish, with some foreign grammatical forms engrafted on it. Were the question, for example, simply—

---

[1] "We are at once met by the startling fact that he abandons the grammar used in the Lowlands of Scotland and attempts to imitate all the inflexions of the Midland dialect of Chaucer, evidently considering him as furnishing the true model of literary form."—*Id.* xxv. I am not to be held as admitting that the author *abandons the grammar used in the Lowlands of Scotland and attempts to imitate all the inflexions* of the Midland dialect of Chaucer. I have already said that the artificiality of the poem is, in my opinion, much overstated by Professor Skeat. *Vide* Note C, App. p. 81.

Whether is the poem written by a Lowland Scot or by an Englishman? the answer could only be "by a Scot." That being so we may ask, How did James, who left Scotland in his twelfth year, come to be able in 1423 to employ the Scottish dialect as a literary medium? His education for eighteen years had been that of an Englishman. His preceptors were Englishmen. The poem, if James was the author, should have been, one would expect, in the Midland dialect—the speech of the Court—with perhaps here and there a few words peculiar to the North that he might chance to have remembered from boyhood or have acquired from occasional intercourse with a chaplain or some of the Scottish nobles who now and again were allowed to visit him in his exile. Are we to believe that the prince, educated in all the wisdom of the English, had through the eighteen years of his captivity retained the vernacular of his childhood so as to be able to write it as well as any Scot who had never been out of his native country? That certainly will not be readily believed. Professor Skeat saw the difficulty. How does he attempt to explain it? "James," he tells us, "was perfectly acquainted with the Lowland dialect. This is ascertained by the preservation of a most interesting document entirely in the king's own hand: written at Croydon in 1412. It runs as follows:[1] 'Jamis throu the grace of God. Kynge of Scottis. Til all that this lettre heris or seis sendis gretynge. Wit ye that we haue grauntit and be this presentis lettres grauntis a speciall confirmacioun in the mast forme til oure traiste and wele belofit Cosyng Schyr William of Douglas of Drumlangrig of all the landis that he is possessit and chartrit of within the Kyngdome of Scotlande that is for to say the landis of drumlangrig of Hawyke and of Selkirke the whilkis chartris and possessiouns be this lettre we conferme and wil for the mare sekernes this our confirmacioune be formabilli efter the fourme of our chaunssellur and the tenor of his chartris selit with oure grete sele in tyme to come, in witness of the whilkis this presentis lettres we wrate with our propre hande undir the

[1] I take the translation from the *Nat. MSS. of Scotland*, Part II., lxii. Professor Skeat points out Chalmers' misprints, *till*, *al*, *daie* for *til*, *all*, *dai*, but there are errors in the version he himself gives, *e.g.* *charterit* and *charts* should be *chartrit* and *chartris*. The facsimile reads "chanusselur," a mistake for "chaunssellur."

signet usit in selyng of oure lettres as now at Croidoune the last dai of November the yere of oure lorde I^{mo} cccc^{o}xij^{o}.'"

Professor Skeat found the charter in Chalmers' edition of the *Kingis Quair*, where it is printed in facsimile—"the only thing of value," he says, "in an otherwise valueless edition,"[1]—and he accepts it as sufficient proof of James's knowledge of Lowland Scottish. It is surely the strangest adminicle of evidence ever put forward in a serious probation. If it is to have the slightest value attached to it, we must suppose James at the age of eighteen skilful enough to prepare a legal charter-by-progress; for, if he simply transcribed it from a draft prepared for him, it will not prove the least knowledge on his part of Lowland Scottish. Now, a fifteenth century youth could have been no better qualified, in ordinary circumstances, to prepare such a writ than a youth in the present day: and if we grant the exiled prince to have been as expert as the average law apprentice to-day—which is surely a liberal assumption—the verdict of those qualified to judge will decide against the document as constituting any real evidence of his power to compose in his native tongue. Such charters are not prepared in the present day by the conveyancer without the style-book, neither were they in any of the earlier centuries.

If it were deserving of serious consideration—which it is not—it might even be possible on several grounds to impugn its authenticity,[2] but it is

---

[1] The facsimile in Chalmers is no facsimile. It is "restored," as any one can see by comparing it with the facsimile in the *Nat. MSS. of Scotland, supra.* The king's signet has quite disappeared, yet in Chalmers it is given as perfect!

[2] The following general objections against its authenticity readily suggest themselves, viz.:

(*a*) The formula used. The document is not a "Signature," *i.e.* a warrant from which the charter of lands held of the Crown always originated; nor a "Warrant" for expeding a charter approved by the King or his Barons of Exchequer; neither is it, in a strict sense, to be spoken of as a Crown charter; yet it unquestionably is highly technical. In the first quarter of the fifteenth century, all Crown charters were written in Latin; if this document is genuine, it is, as being in the vernacular, unique. It purports to be a charter confirming Sir William Douglas in the lands of Drumlanrig, etc., and I would therefore describe it as intended to be a Charter of Confirmation: *vide* (*e*) *infra.*

(*b*) It is the sole extant instance of the exercise of sovereignty by James during the entire eighteen years of his captivity.

(*c*) It is the only specimen of James's caligraphy extant. There is nothing of his

enough at present to show that from its very nature James cannot have been the draughtsman, but, at most, only the copyist. It is certainly no voucher at all for his knowledge of and power to write in Lowland Scottish.

We must therefore, each for himself, decide the question on the plain facts, namely,—that James, eleven years and seven months old when captured, exiled in England for eighteen years, and educated there in a manner that left nothing to be desired, yet retained—if we are to believe the editors—his Northern dialect so as to be able to use it as a literary medium in 1423. The historical evidence, be it remembered, professes to tell the latest date when the poem was composed. The Bodleian manuscript says expressly: "maid be King James of Scotland, etc., quhne his Majestie wes in Ingland"; so too John Major in terms similar: "Before his marriage and during his captivity he wrote a book about the Queen," etc.

---

known to be preserved in the Register House, Edinburgh, the British Museum, or the Record Office, London.

(*d*) The charter is written in the beautiful professional hand of the scrivener or church notary, and for that reason it is extremely unlikely to be by James. If he did write it, then it is a unique instance in conveyancing of a sovereign performing the humble office of scrivener.

(*e*) Lord Archibald Douglas received a grant of lands "from his Aunt Isobel, styled Countess of Mar, sometime before 1405, for in that year Robert III. bestowed the lands on Sir David Fleming, of Biggar, on the plea that they were alienated without the royal assent. But on 30 Novr., 1412, while still a prisoner in England, King James I. confirmed the Charter of Isobel in favour of Sir Wm. Douglas" (*The Douglas Book*, Vol. I., 320). To get back the family lands, or at least to keep alive the claim, during the Regency, there was a motive for fabricating such a document.

(*f*) The charter appears never to have passed the Great Seal.

(*g*) The charter is not witnessed, and the King's signet, which might have been subjected to crucial test, has quite disappeared. "To receive the Seal, two slips of vellum have been affixed in the form of a cross and the seal impressed at the crossing: the wax has been mostly rubbed off" (*vide Nat. MSS. of Scotland*, Part II., Pref. xiv.). The absence of the signet (the most important thing of the grant) is itself calculated to arouse suspicion.

(*h*) The language of the charter seems to me to belong to a later time than 1412 and the terminology is also in my opinion of later date. There is *inter alia* the suspicious plural form, "the quhilkis chartris." What are the arguments that can be advanced for the authenticity of the charter?

Now, for James to have employed the Northern dialect in such a poem, —even were it credible that he was able to do so—would surely have been ungracious, unless, indeed, like another Lucentio, wooing under the guise of a schoolmaster, he was attuning Joan's ear to the rude speech of his Scottish subjects, whose queen she was soon to be. Among his English tutors, too, the product of his Muse must have produced something like consternation, when they found their accomplished pupil using unfamiliar Northern words, and transgressing the rules of accidence they had been striving during so many years to inculcate. Was the chicken turning out a gosling and taking to the water? The rugged dialect doubtless was bad enough, but the *I stenten* and such like blunders, one may well imagine, must have made tutors despair of imparting the courtly Midland speech to any foreigner, caught ever so young![1]

But, in deciding the question, we can have aid from other facts which are certainly very relevant to the present issue. The *Kingis Quair* is not the only Scottish poem that exhibits the strange admixture of Northern and Midland dialect. It is a fact beyond dispute, that about the middle of the fifteenth century—between 1440 and 1480—the imitation of Chaucerian inflexions was a vogue among Scottish poets. There is a group of poems very similar in this respect to the *Kingis Quair*. To name only three, there are *The Romaunt of the Rose*,[2] *The Court of Love*, and *Lancelot of the Lak*. In these, Chaucerian imitations abound. Each of them contributes inflexions that have never been used by English writers "since the language has had written monuments to show what it really was"—

[1] I have already expressed a doubt as to much of the alleged artificiality (Notes, pp. 108, 109). As regards the example here cited, my friend, Mr. George Neilson, referred me to line 2 of st. 104, and line 1 of st. 54,

104. "A quhile I stynt, abiding efter grace,"
54. "Anothirquhile the lytill nightingale,"

and suggested that the false accidence in the line of st. 117,

"And quhen I wepe and stynten othir quhile,"

is due to an error of the scribe—the simple emendation being,

"And quhen I wepe and stynt anothirquhile."

Were I an editor I certainly would have no hesitation about accepting the amended reading.

[2] (Fragment B, ll. 1706-5810) Chaucer's Works, *Ib.*, Vol. 1.

the "errors of men striving to do what they had not the special knowledge to accomplish."[1] Nor are the errors to be attributed to a Scottish scribe *wilfully* altering an English original; "the very reverse," says Dr. J. A. H. Murray, "appears manifest."[2] In editing *Lancelot* for the Early English Text Society, Professor Skeat admits the same thing: "It is most probable that the older copy was written in the Lowland Scottish dialect, the whole tone going to prove this."[3] The late Richard Morris—*nomen clarum venerabile*—was of the same opinion. In *Lancelot*, the Scottish author ventured once or twice to abandon Northern rimes, but, as we have seen, the author of the *Kingis Quair* was more cautious. His "'prentice han'" was more than sufficiently exercised in striving after something of the mellifluousness of his master Chaucer, without essaying the more complicated Midland rimes.

This would be the proper place, no doubt, to discuss at large the diction of the *Kingis Quair*, but I prefer to leave the task to others better qualified.[4] At present I desire merely to direct attention to a few points, each one of which by itself has been made by philologists a criterion for determining the early or late date, in the fifteenth century, of a literary composition. These are[5]—(1) the presence of certain French

---

[1] Lounsbury's *Studies in Chaucer*, Vol. I.

[2] Quoted in *Ratis Raving*, by J. R. Lumby (E. E. T. S.), Pref. xi. Dr. Murray refers to the "remarkable transformation which the dialect has undergone in Sir Lancelot," leading him to suppose that it was not due to the copyist, "but to a previous writer, if not to the author himself, who perhaps affected *Southernism* as was done a century later by Lyndesay and Knox." . . . "The Southern forms are certainly often shown by the rhyme to be original, and such a form as *tone* for *tane* = taken, is more likely to have been that of a Northener trying to write Southern, than of a Southern scribe who knew no such word existed in his dialect."

[3] *Id.*, Pref. xvi.

[4] *Vide* Note C, App. p. 154.

[5] In Dr. Murray's brilliant essay, *The Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland* (*Philological Society's Transactions*, 1872), one finds many suggestions by which to test the diction of a poem like the *Kingis Quair*, *e.g.* (1) the presence of certain French words found in Scottish writers after 1440. (2) The plural form *quhilkis*. (3) One of Dr. Murray's arguments against King James's authorship of *Peebles to the Play* (and, if I may say so, in my opinion, a sound one) is the repeated use of the indefinite article or distinguishing adjective, *ane*, before a consonant—an impossible characteristic of a poem earlier in date

words found in Scottish writers later than 1440, (2) the plural form *quhilkis*, (3) the distinguishing adjective *ane* before a consonant, (4) the participle in *yt* or *it*, (5) the pronouns *thaire* and *thame*, and (6) the employment of the verb *to do* in the emphatic conjugation.

By those who return a verdict on the issue under debate, the significant failure of the poem—assuming it to belong to the first quarter of the

---

than the middle of the fifteenth century. Mr. Lumby also quotes approvingly the following dictum: "The indefinite article is as in Northern English of same date, *a* before a consonant, *an* or *ane* before a vowel, in contrast with the Middle Scottish usage, as in *ane buik, ane kyng*, which appears in the Acts of the Scottish Parliament between 1475 and 1500." Now *ane* is found in the *Kingis Quair* before a consonant at least eight times. It occurs in st. 28, 48, 49, 70, 76, 98, 154, 160. Strangely enough, Professor Skeat has omitted *ane* in his glossarial index to the *Kingis Quair*. (4) Dr. Murray, referring to the "*Craft of Deyng*" (vide pref., *Ratis Raving*, p. xi.) as a specimen of the Scottish language probably next in age to the early part of the Royal MS. of Wyntoun's Cronykil (c. 1440), says, that it is later than that MS. "appears from the fact that while the past participle in Wyntoun still retains the Anglo-Saxon *d*, ending usually in *yd*, in the '*Craft of Deyng*' it has become the more exclusively Scotch *yt*. Probably, therefore, we may consider it as representing the language of the middle of the century. . . . '*Ratis Raving*' is apparently later, the orthography being much more assimilated to that of the middle period." Now the same is true of the *Kingis Quair*. The past participle in *d* and *yd* is absent altogether, and the later form *yt* scarcely appears. Throughout the poem it is found in the latest form *it*—*e.g. clippit, decretit*, etc. Note also the rimed participle in st. 162. If literary criticism has hitherto proceeded on sound lines, the like canon applied to the *Kingis Quair* will determine its date as unquestionably later than 1440. (5) The pronouns *hem* = them, and *hir* = their, are not once found, but always *thame* and *thaire*. I may cite, *e.g.*, stanzas 78 to 93 inclusive, where *thaire* and *thame* occur nearly fifty times! If *hem* and *hir* be substituted, the music of the verse is most sadly marred. (6) The verb *to do* is employed very frequently in the emphatic conjugation throughout the poem. *Vide* Lounsbury's *Studies in Chaucer*, Vol. I., as to this test.

The fifth category has, of course, a bearing on the English characteristics of the *Kingis Quair*, *hem* and *hir* not being Scottish of the period.

Perhaps we shall hear of the misdeeds of scribes as a disturbing factor, but their backs, broad though they be, will never carry the load of reconciling the editorial theory with the actual text of the *Kingis Quair*, preserving throughout its anomalies a unity so distinctive. *Vide* Note C, App. p. 154.

I may perhaps better state here that I cannot accept many of the examples of "Chaucerian inflexions" noted by Professor Skeat as occurring in the *Kingis Quair*. When due value is given to the vowel sounds of Lowland Scottish, scansion is obtained, in the preponderance of cases, without the necessity for the sounding of final *e* as a distinct syllable.

fifteenth century—to answer to any of these tests will be considered, as well as the biographical facts which condition any title of James to be acknowledged as the author.

(*b*) THE COURT OF LOVE.

We shall take another point furnished by the internal evidence of the poem.

In 1783, when preparing his transcript for the press, Mr. Tytler observed the many Chaucerian imitations, and in particular noted a striking resemblance between the *Kingis Quair* and the well-known poem, the *Court of Love*. His note is as follows: "No doubt our poet must have seen and had in his eye Chaucer's *Court of Love* when he wrote his own poem"; but having in that particular manner drawn attention to the fact, he left each reader to collate the passages for himself.[1]

When we come, however, to the Scottish Text Society edition, we remark at once a difference in the method of editing. The text itself receives the most painstaking care; meanings of words are explained; nice points of grammar are discussed; phrases and short passages are compared with Chaucerian poems; but in no single instance with the *Court of Love*.

What is the explanation? In the last century, and indeed far down into the present, everybody believed the *Court of Love* to be by Chaucer, and consequently it was read by Tytler as critically as any of the genuine Chaucerian poems. The value of his observation, I may remark, is not in the least degree affected by the error in regarding the poem as by Chaucer. Simply his critical acumen is on trial.[2] We can test the point precisely as he did, by reading both poems carefully. The imperfect information about the authorship of the *Court of Love* merely imposed

---

[1] I ought to mention that Mr. Tytler, in the case of the description of Rosial, quotes the stanzas *ad longum*, p. 85 *et seq.* His footnotes also show that he had the *Court of Love* well in his view at all times, and he probably saw no need for particular collation.

[2] I would bear testimony to his acumen, which is everywhere evident.

a limitation, and rendered impossible the perception of the true bearing of his observation on the question of the authorship of the *Kingis Quair*. That was all.

In the case of Professor Skeat, however, it is different. It is not wronging him to say that he never for a moment seems to have had the least doubt, any more than Tytler, about James the First being the author of the *Kingis Quair*; on the contrary, he goes beyond any former editor, and confidently fixes the very month and year (May, 1423) when it was composed by the king; and as a consequence he had no choice but to push aside the *Court of Love*. For if James was the author of the *Kingis Quair*, it was impossible he could have seen the *Court of Love*; and, on the other hand, it is equally true that if the author of the *Kingis Quair* saw the *Court of Love*, and had it in his view when he wrote, James the First could not have been the author.[1] The question therefore resolves itself into one of fact, and falls to be adjudicated after a fair comparison of the one poem with the other.

Before proceeding to compare the poems, I desire to say that I believe the theme of the *Kingis Quair* to be the story of James the First's courting of Joan Beaufort. There is no hint of the names of either of the lovers, or of their rank; all the same, I see no reason for believing them to be other than James and Joan.

Every one who studies it carefully will discover that the author, whoever he may have been, was a close student of Chaucer. He seems indeed to have been so familiar with the works, and so saturated with the style and mannerisms of the English poet, that he probably often was almost unconscious that he was imitating. The many stray lines found throughout the poem, almost literally transferred from Chaucer, and, it may be, written down from memory, as well as the palpable imitation of the passage in *The Knight's Tale*, where we are told of Palamon's first sight of Emelie, are obvious to any reader now; but there are also many reminiscences

---

[1] *Studies in Chaucer*, Vol. I. Professor Lounsbury remarks that the evidence against the *Court of Love* being a Chaucerian poem is overwhelming. It fails to conform to every test which has been laid down. There are things in it which point to the composition of the poem as belonging to the latter half of the fifteenth century.

pervading the poem which, though not so apparent, are nevertheless present, and easily recognizable by every one who is acquainted with the works of Chaucer.

At present, however, we are only concerned with these Chaucerian imitations in so far as they affect the phase we are about to discuss, namely, the relation of the *Kingis Quair* to the *Court of Love*. For it is undoubted that the anonymous author of the *Court of Love* was, like the author of the *Kingis Quair*, an extensive borrower from Chaucer; and in considering how far any passage or incident in the *Kingis Quair* is an imitation, it will be necessary to compare it, not only with the *Court of Love*, but also with the works of Chaucer, to ascertain whether it be borrowed direct from Chaucer, or be related to his poems only in the second degree. Let me suppose that in the *Kingis Quair* the lady had been described as "of mene stature," which is the description of Criseyde and also of Rosial. In such an instance of exact correspondence it would be absurd to contend that the author of the *Kingis Quair* had necessarily borrowed from the *Court of Love*. So, again, where we find Criseyde, Rosial, and Joan described as having "golden hair," such agreement practically proves nothing. On the other hand, where we find in the *Kingis Quair* only a far-off resemblance to Chaucer, but a close correspondence to the diction or particular treatment of the *Court of Love*, it is equally absurd to point to Chaucer as the original—which, it seems to me, is what Professor Skeat has done in a considerable number of instances, as I shall endeavour to show.

But here some one may ask, How can we know that the author of the *Court of Love* did not imitate the works of Chaucer and also the *Kingis Quair*? May not the *Kingis Quair* be the exemplar of the *Court of Love*? Such a thing has never been suggested hitherto by any one: nor is it likely to be by any one who reads the two poems critically. The *Court of Love* is excellently handled as regards its theme; its unity is indeed one of its great charms. It is not, I hope, unduly to depreciate the *Kingis Quair* as a poetical composition to say that it lacks artistic unity.[1] We feel in reading it, that the author, wishing to celebrate the

[1] Professor Skeat admits this himself. He says (Introd., p. xiv), "Notwithstanding

wooing of the royal lovers, has used a model not particularly well adapted to his purpose. It is constructed, pieced together—the parts not well joined. There is a good deal in it that is mechanical, notwithstanding the poetic beauty of much of its detail.

In the first forty-six stanzas, the author is much less hampered by his models than in the remainder of the poem. It is, however, when he reaches stanza 74 that one feels the theme beginning to run less smoothly. The visit to the Court of Venus is simply an addendum, and the author's difficulty now is to adjust conventional details in a real love story. While he uses Chaucer freely as a model in many details in the opening stanzas, it appears to me to be unquestionable that he also had the *Court of Love* in his view, although that poem is more particularly requisitioned in the later portion of the *Kingis Quair*. To myself it appears plain that the author of the *Kingis Quair*, being better acquainted with the Chaucerian poems, more easily adapted portions of these poems as he required. The Chaucerian imitations are more in the texture of his poem—the warp and woof—than the other. He seems to have gathered out of the *Court of Love*, here and there, such things as suited his purpose, and to have been less able to assimilate them with his own work. Hence the imitations of the *Court of Love* are easily identified, because generally lying more on the surface.

For example, I agree with Tytler that the description of Joan, beginning at stanza 46, is modelled on the *Court of Love*.[1] Here are the passages, placed side by side:

---

that some art has been shown in giving a certain connectedness to the whole by (as I suppose) the subsequent introduction of occasional connecting phrases, some want of order still remains."

[1] The stanzas of the *Court of Love* not being numbered, I have thought it desirable to indicate each stanza cited by me. There are in the edition of the *Court of Love* I have used (Bell's *Chaucer*, edition 1889, Vol. IV., p. 280) 206 stanzas in all. By marking opposite each its number, the reader will very easily find the passages cited. In Tytler's edition, the *Kingis Quair* is divided into Cantos without any warrant from the MS. To follow Tytler's numbering, throughout Canto II., add the number 19; Canto III., add 73; Canto IV., add 123; Canto V., add 151; Canto VI., add 172.

"Kingis Quair."	"Court of Love."
46. "Off hir array the form gif I sall write Toward hir goldin haire and rich atyre In fret-wise couchit was with perlliss quhite And grete balas lemyng as the fyre, With mony ane emeraut and faire saphire; And on hir hede a chaplet fresch of hewe Off plumys partit rede and quhite and blewe."	112. . . . "Her here as gold"
. . . . .	116. . . . . . "But how she was arrayed, if ye me bidde, That shall I wele discovere you and saye A bend of gold and silk ful fresh and gaye With here in tresse, y'broudered ful wele Right smoothly kempt and shining every dele."
48. "About hir nek quhite as the fyre amaille A gudely cheyne of smale orfeuerye Quhareby there hung a ruby, without faille, Lyke to ane hert schapin verily, That, as a sperk of lowe so wantonly Semyt birnyng upon hir quhyte throte; Now gif there was gud partye, god it wote!"	117. "About hir neck a floure of fresh devise, With rubies set that lusty were to sene, And she in gown was light and summer-wise, Shapen ful wel, the colour was of grene, With aureit seint about hir sides clene, With divers stones precious and rich, Thus was she rayed yet saw I never her lich."
. . . . .	. . . . .
50. "In hir was zouth, beautee with humble aport, Bountee, richesse and womanly facture, God better wote than my pen can report."	119. "In bounte, favour, port and semlinesse, Pleasaunt of figure, mirrour of delight, Gracious to sene and root of al gentilnes."
. . . . .	. . . . .

In arraying a Joan or a Rosial, the early poets were fond of barbaric splendour—gold, jewels, precious stones, rich trappings, and all accessories calculated to produce wonder and delight: the "gud partye" was a secondary thing. Now, when the two portraits are carefully examined, the likeness—in general and in particular—is striking.[1] Joan, indeed, is the more bejewelled, but her

> "Grete balas lemyng as the fyre
> With mony ane emeraut and faire saphire,"

[1] Tytler very properly observes that "in the Prince's situation, viewing from his window in the Tower of Windsor the beautiful Jane walking below in the palace garden, he could not with propriety have given a minute description of her features," as the author of the *Court of Love* has done in the case of Rosial.

most likely was suggested by another passage in the *Court of Love*, where we read:

12. "No sapphire of Inde, no ruby rich of price
There lacked than, nor emerald so grene,
Balais Turkeis, ne thing to my devise."

It certainly is notable to find *balas* = ruby,[1] used in both poems. The word is non-Chaucerian, nor does it once occur, so far as I know, in any other English poem of the fifteenth century.

Professor Skeat says the description of Joan should be compared with the description of Criseyde in Chaucer's *Troilus* (B. v., ll. 807-827), which is as follows:

116. "Criseyde mene was of hir stature
Ther-to of shap, of face and eek of chere
Ther mighte been no fairer creature
And ofte tyme this was hir manere
To gon y-tressed with hir heres clere
Doun by hir coler at hir bak behinde
Which with a threde of gold she wolde binde.

117. "And, save hir browes joyneden y-fere
Ther nas no lak, in ought I can espyen;
But for to speken of hir eyen clere
Lo trewely, they writen that hir syen
That Paradys stood formed in hir yën
And with her riche beautee ever more
Strof love in hir, ay which of hem was more.

118. "She sobre was, eek simple and wys with-al
The best y-norisshed eek that mighte be
And goodly of hir speche in general
Charitable, estatliche, lusty and free,
No never-mo ne lakkede hir pitee;
Tendre-herted, slydinge of corage;
But trewely I can not telle hir age."

---

[1] Balay est d'un rose clair, le vrai rubis d'un rouge vif de cochinille (*Glossaire Français du Moyen Age*, Laborde). Tytler quotes the lines thus:

"No saphire of Inde, no rubie rich of price
Nor emeraud so grene, nor Balais."—p. 82.

Now, I venture to think, most persons reading the three descriptions will be of opinion that between Criseyde and Joan there is scarcely any resemblance, and not much either between Criseyde and Rosial. There are indeed reminiscences of Chaucer both in the descriptions of Joan and of Rosial, but they certainly are not modelled on Criseyde; besides, it is most observable that some of these reminiscences are the very points in which the *Kingis Quair* and the *Court of Love* differ the one from the other, showing, as it seems to me, that the author of the *Kingis Quair* avoided too slavish imitation of the *Court of Love* by choosing just such felicitous phrases from Chaucer as appeared best to suit his purpose.

It would be tedious to attempt here to go through the poems, tracing the imitations one by one; indeed it is scarcely possible to do so satisfactorily, for besides the verbal imitations there is often an affinity of thought which will appear only to the reader who is prepared to take some trouble for himself. I must therefore confine myself to a few examples, leaving much to be sought out by those who are interested to pursue the subject further.[1]

In stanza 51 of the *Kingis Quair*, which immediately follows the description of Joan, the poet makes James, when he realizes the lady to be "a warldly creature,"[2] to say:

> "And at the last my luke unto the hevin
> I threwe furthwith and said thir versis sevin."

"Thir versis sevin," curiously enough, means the *seven-line stanza* which follows, beginning:

> 52. "O Venus clere! of goddis stellifyit!
> To whom I yelde homage and sacrifise."

Now, in the *Court of Love*, immediately following the description of Rosial, the poet makes Philogenet to say:

> 120. "And up I put my bille with sentence clere."

---

[1] *Vide* note D, Appendix, p. 156.

[2] Contrast with st. 118 of the *Court of Love*, where Rosial is described as "lich a thing celestial"; also st. 141, where she is spoken of as an "erthly creature."

The "bille" which, it is noticeable, extends to *seven stanzas*, is the exact equivalent of "thir versis sevin," and we find Philogenet doing homage to Rosial. It begins:

121. "O ye fresh, of beaute the root,"

and goes on:

122. "Now am I caught and unware suddenly
With persaunt stremes of your eye so clere,
Subject to been and serven you mekely
And al your man."

"Al your man" is of course the phrase for "your vassal"—words of homage. Rosial replies in one stanza, and Philogenet again addresses her, ending thus:

129. "Beseche I you but seen my wil and rede,
And let your answer put me out of drede."

Do we not hear the very echo of these words in the concluding lines of James's "bille"?

52. "Now help me furth and for your merci lede
My hert to rest that deis nere for drede."

In stanza 77 of the *Kingis Quair*, the poet enters the Court of Venus, and sees "within a chamber large, rowm and faire," a great crowd of devotees. Stanza 78 describes the "grete repaire of peple":

78. "This is to seyne, that present in the place
Me thoght I saw of every nacioun
Loueris that endit had thaire lyfis space
In lovis service, mony a mylioun
Off quhois chancis maid is mencioun
In diverse bukis, quho thame list to se
And therefore here thaire names lat I be."[1]

---

[1] Compare also st. 79 of the *Kingis Quair*, "aboue thaire hedis writin there I fand," etc., with st. 34 of the *Court of Love*.

No doubt the poet, when he referred to "diverse bukis," was thinking, among others, of Chaucer's *Prologue to Good Women*, as well as of the *Court of Love*; but his borrowing is almost entirely from the latter poem. The "mony a mylioun" is "many a thousand" and "a thousand million" in the *Court of Love*. But let us examine some of the details; it will not be uninteresting.

I can only refer to stanzas 79 to 89 of the *Kingis Quair*, as they are too long to quote—where the lovers at the Court of Venus are enumerated. We hear of, among others, "martris and confessouris," "gude folkis" with "hedis hore"; "fresche folkis yong"; "a full grete nowmer" "in capis wyde and lang" with "thaire hudis all atoure thair eyen"; a "warld of folke," showing by their countenance that "thaire hertis semyt full of displeasance."[1] Here is stanza 83:

> "And therewithall apperit unto me
> A voce and said, 'tak hede, man and behold:
> Zonder thou seis the hiest stage and gree
> Off agit folk, with hedis hore and olde.
> Zone were the folke that neuir change wold
> In lufe, but trewly seruit him alway
> In euery age unto thaire ending-day.'"

Now, in the *Court of Love* we find nearly the same enumeration. We have (1) the aged folk, described also as "the folk in blew," the colour blue being used to denote their steadfastness in love:[2]

> 36. "Lo yonder folk, quoth she, that kneele in blew,
> They weare the colour aye and ever shalle,
> In sign they ever were and wille be trew
> Withouten chaunge";

---

[1] Tytler says, "I apprehend the poet has had the celebrated Tablature of Cebes in his view."

[2] So used in Chaucer, *Troilus* iii., l. 885:

"bereth him this blewe ring."

Balade against Women unconstant:

"In stede of blew, thus may ye were al grene.'

Anelida ll. 330-32:

"Clad in asure
To profren eft a newe assure
For to be trewe."

Azure = true blue.

(2) the "saints," by which are meant the martyrs for love:

> 18. "There saints have their comming and resort";

(3) the crowd that "ben in black," described thus:

> 37. "Yea than, quoth I, what done these prestes here,
> Nunnes and hermits freres and alle tho," etc.,

correspond to the "folk of religioun" in stanza 88 of the *Kingis Quair*:

> "And efter this upon zone stage adoun
> Tho that thou seis stand in capis wyde,
> Zone were quhilum folk of religioun
> That from the warld thaire gouernance did hide," etc.[1]

Let the Court of Venus in the two poems be carefully compared, and I venture to say every unprejudiced person will be convinced that there is a relationship impossible to be explained away, and that the *Kingis Quair* is directly modelled on the *Court of Love*.[2]

One is not surprised to find Philogenet, "a clerk of Cambridge," being told that his birth and Rosial's are not equal, and that his ability may not compare with hers:

> 149. "Thy birth and hers they be nothing egale,"

and

> 150. "And eke remember thine abilitie
> May not compare with her, this well thou wote";

but it is surely rather less fitting to find the same thing in the *Kingis*

---

[1] The author of the *Kingis Quair* has both expanded and curtailed certain details of the *Court of Love*, and in such instances, especially in his omissions, he shows himself to be decidedly the superior literary artist. There is a strain of coarseness in the *Court of Love*, *e.g.* in the particular description of Rosial (st. 112 to 114), but the *Kingis Quair* is limpidly pure throughout, in this respect reminding one of George Wither's *Philarete*.

[2] I quite expect that at first some readers will incline to regard certain things in both poems as "mediaeval commonplaces," but a critical examination will alter that view. The *sequence* of many of the imitations, once caught, is perfectly convincing. I am hopeful that note D, p. 156, will be found helpful.

Quair said of a king and an earl's daughter. James is thus addressed by Venus:

> 109. "And zit considering the nakitnesse
> Bothe of thy wit, thy persone and thy myght
> It is no mach of thyne unworthynesse
> To hir hie birth, estate and beautee bryght."

These must suffice for a few of the examples of imitation. Let me now briefly direct attention to other evidences of copying, which to some may appear as convincing as similarities in thought and diction and in the construction of the poems.

It will be remembered that I have directed attention to the use of the very uncommon word "balas" in both poems. That single instance, I submit, would be of some value in deciding a question like the one we are at present discussing. But there are two others yet to be cited. The first relates to the word "smaragde," signifying "an emerald." In the *Court of Love* we find it used by the author in describing the lustre of Rosial's eyes. He says:

> 113. "And eke her eyen ben bright and orient
> As is the smaragde."

One is not surprised to find the editor of Bell's edition of Chaucer adding a note that "light green eyes would not be beautiful."[1] It is, I fancy, quite unnecessary to argue that point. Rosial, it will be remembered, is described as golden-haired. The poet was surely ignorant of the 'smaragde' being a green stone.

Come now to the *Kingis Quair*. What do we find in it? The author has used the same word in stanza 155:

> "The lyoun king and his fere lyonesse,
> The pantere, like unto the smaragdyne."[2]

In an interesting note by Professor Skeat we read, "Tytler wonders how

---

[1] Tytler also annotated these lines in the *Court of Love* thus: "Smaragdus = an emerald. Eyes of emerald or green colour cannot be beautiful. Chaucer meant only to compare his mistress's eyes in brightness to the orient emerald. The simile, however, is not well chosen."

[2] Smaragdynes = smaragde, is a form found in *Du Cange*.

the panther could be like an emerald. The fact is, the poet follows the usual description in the old so-called 'Bestiaries,' or descriptions of beasts. Compare, for example, the *Bestiary* printed by Dr. Morris for the Early English Text Society; the *Bestiary of Philip de Thaun* in Anglo-French, printed in Mr. Wright's *Popular Treatises on Science*; A. Neckam, *de Naturis Rerum*, ed. T. Wright; Solinus' *Polyhistor*, and the like. In a description of the panther in the *Codex Exoniensis*, ed. Thorpe, it is described as being of various colours, *like Joseph's coat.* In A. Golding's translation of Solinus (Lib. I., c. 26) it is said of panthers that 'the hayre of their skins . . . is either white or *of a skye colour*'; and Neckam (p. 214) says the same. I suspect that our author is confusing the colour of the emerald with that of the sky." That annotation proves conclusively enough that the panther was regarded as of "sky colour." Professor Skeat, however, failed to note that the author of the *Kingis Quair* keeps company with the author of the *Court of Love*, both authors being ignorant of the true colour of the "smaragde," and alike employing it as signifying *blue.*[1] They did not get the error from Chaucer, for he appears to have known the stone to be green in colour.[2]

The other instance I wish to direct attention to is a phrase found twice in the *Kingis Quair*, (1) in stanza 45:

> "Quhen I a lytill thrawe had maid my moon
> Bewailing myn infortune and my chance,
> Unknawin how or quhat was best to doon
> So ferre I-fallyng into lufis dance,"

and again in stanza 185:

> "And eke for tham that ar noght entrit inne
> The dance of lufe."

"Lufis dance" is thus annotated by Professor Skeat:
"This curious expression occurs in Chaucer's *C. T.* 478: it is said of the

---

[1] Sky colour = vair, bluish-grey.

[2] *Vide* Boethius, note p. 80 (Vol. II. *Chaucer*, Clarendon Press edition). The further fact that in the *Court of Love* and in the *Kingis Quair* both "emeraut" and "smaragde" are used, goes also to prove the authors' ignorance of the real nature of the smaragde.

Wife of Bath that she knew 'the olde daunce' of the art of love. It occurs again in *C. T.* 12013, and in *Troil.*, B. III., l. 696. Tyrwhitt explains it by 'game,' and remarks that the French have the same phrase, citing from Cotgrave (*s.v.* Danse) the expression, *Elle sçait assez de la vieille danse*,—the translation of which is to be found in l. 4300 of the *Romaunt of the Rose*—'For she knew al the olde daunce.'" Now, while Professor Skeat perfectly understood the phrase, and quite properly noted an analogous phrase made use of by Chaucer, he is in error in stating that the "curious" expressions, "Lufis dance" and the "dance of lufe," or either of them, occur in the Chaucerian passages cited by him.

In the "Wife of Bath" (Prologue *C. T.* 478) the line is,

> "For she coude of that art the olde daunce";

in "The Phisiciens Tale" (*C. T.* 12013),

> "And knowen wel y-nough the olde daunce";

while in *Troilus* (B. III., l. 695) it is,

> "The olde daunce and every poynt ther-inne."

So also, as we have seen, is it in the *Romaunt of the Rose*. There is a difference, however, between "the olde daunce" and the phrase we are discussing, when the question is whence the author of the *Kingis Quair* derived it. Now I point out that the identical phrase occurs in the *Court of Love*:

> "And falsely now they footen love's daunce
> Barren of routh."

This coincidence, standing by no means alone, is but little weakened by the fact that the phrase "*love's daunce*," does once occur in Chaucer, although not in a passage[1] adverted to by Professor Skeat. For it must be correlated with many other things. We have the very unusual word "balas" employed by both authors; we find both authors wrongly employing "smaragde" in the same sense in their poems; while yet another phrase cited by Professor Skeat as "peculiar" is also found in the *Kingis*

---

[1] *Troilus*, B. II., l. 1106: a passage pointed out to me, just on the eve of going to press, by Professor W. S. M'Cormick.

Quair and the *Court of Love.* That group of facts, taken in conjunction with affinities in thought, framework, and diction, amounts, I submit, to proof of the proposition that the Scottish author had the *Court of Love* in his view when composing the *Kingis Quair.* The data are simple and the inference is plain.

(*c*) AUTOBIOGRAPHY ON ITS TRIAL.

The third and last point of internal evidence to be discussed at present, relates to certain quasi-biographical facts mentioned in the poem. It will be all the clearer if we note the conflicting statements of Wyntoun and Bower about the capture of James, before examining a passage in Professor Skeat's Introduction.

In the *Cronykil* (B. IX., c. 15) under the year 1394, Wyntoun records the birth of James:

> "Oure King Jamys in Scotland syne
> That yere wes borne in Dunfermline."

In chapter 25 he tells us that James, while voyaging to France, was taken prisoner by the English on Palm Sunday, 1405; and in the succeeding chapter (26) the death of Robert III. is recorded as having taken place at Dundonald on the feast of St. Ambrose, 4th April, which synchronized with Palm Sunday in the year 1406.

In the *Scotichronicon*[1] Bower says that James was fourteen years of age before he set out on the voyage to France. He dates the capture specifically as 30th March, 1404, and states that Robert III. died of a broken heart soon after hearing of the prince's capture by the English.

It might be possible to suggest an explanation of these conflicting accounts, but to do so at present would lead to needless digression. It is enough to know now for certain that Wyntoun is right as regards both the birth year of James and the date of the death of Robert III. He and Bower, however, as we shall see presently, are wrong as to the year of the capture.

---

[1] B. 15, c. xviii.

Let us now hear Professor Skeat. In the Introduction to the *Kingis Quair* (Scottish Text Society edition)[1] he says: "The facts of his (James's) life that immediately concern the reader of his chief poem may be briefly enumerated. He was born in July,[2], 1394, being the second son[3] of Robert III. and his queen, Annabella Drummond. The readers of Sir Walter Scott's *Fair Maid of Perth* will remember the sad story of the cruel death of James's elder brother, the Duke of Rothesay—a circumstance which determined the king to send his remaining son to France, ostensibly for education, but really with a view to his safety.[4] Accordingly, in the month of March, 1405,[5] Sir David Fleming, the king's kinsman, conducted the young prince to the Bass Rock, in the Firth of Forth, there to await the ship from Leith which was to carry him to France. As Sir David Fleming was returning to Edinburgh, after taking leave of the prince, he was waylaid and slain.[6] Shortly afterwards the ship arrived, and the prince went on board with his tutors and companions. The ship was attacked by an English vessel off Flamborough Head in a time of truce,[7] and in defiance of all right and justice James was taken prisoner, carried to Henry IV. at Windsor,[8] and detained in England for many

---

[1] Introd., p. 1.

[2] The month cannot be stated with certainty. In a letter by Queen Annabella to Richard II., dated from the Abbey of Dunfermline in 1394, "le premier jour d'Auoust," she refers to her recent recovery—"Car nous estremez gisant malade d'enfant masquil, a nom James; et sommes bien et graciousment delivre, la grace de Dieu et de notre dame" (Brit. Mus. Vesp. F, f. 39, n. 1). It is copied in the Appendix to Pinkerton's *Hist. of Scotland*, edition 1797; and also in the Nat. *MSS. of Scotland*, Part II.

[3] A mistake. He was the third son; *vide* "The Genealogy of the Stewarts," *Exch. Rolls*, Vol. IV., App. clxxii.

[4] He was not sent to France for four years after David's death; there is no real evidence for the statement in the text.

[5] A mistake: the year was 1406.

[6] Mr. J. H. Wylie is right in saying, "Early in February he was placed in charge of Sir David Fleming" (*Hist. of England under Henry IV.*, Vol. II., c. 61). Fleming's death took place in February, 1406; his son Malcolm received as heir-at-law a charter to Cumbernauld Castle on April 2, 1406 (*Id.*, c. 61).

[7] A mistake: the truce expired April 19, 1405, *vide* note *infra*.

[8] No evidence for this.

years. It is singular that the various accounts do not seem to be accurate in every particular. Thus Professor Morley speaks of the prince as being 'a boy of fourteen,'[1] when it is quite certain that his age in March, 1405, was ten years and about eight months.[2] Again, the date usually assigned for the prince's capture is the 12th of April, 1405, being Palm Sunday; but in the *Annals of England*, 1876, p. 221, the date assigned is the 30th of March.[3] There is even a doubt as to whether the ship was attacked in the open sea or upon its venturing to approach the shore.[4] These are questions of some interest, because James himself has something to say regarding them. In stanza 22 he tells us he had passed 'the state of innocence,' *i.e.* seven years, by the number of three years, so that he was over ten years old. As to the date of his embarkation he is also explicit. In stanzas 21 and 22 he tells us that he 'took his adventure to pass by sea out of his country when the sun was beginning his course in Aries, and when it was four degrees past midday.' He probably here refers to his first brief experience of the sea in passing by boat from North Berwick to the Bass Rock, a circumstance which impressed his mind so vividly that he was able to remember years afterwards that he entered the boat at one o'clock on the 12th of March, being the day when the sun entered the sign of Aries. In stanza 23 he tells us that when the ship was purveyed with all necessaries, and when the wind was favourable, he and his companions entered the ship early in the morning, and after many farewells and expressions of good wishes for their safe journey from those whom they left behind, they pulled up sail and went forth upon their way. In stanza 24 he expressly says that his ship was attacked at sea and soon overpowered, so that he was taken prisoner by the strong hand, or, to speak it briefly, by force. . . . I have already said that the poem of the *Kingis Quair*, that is, of the king's book, was composed in 1423.[5] I do not find that it has been

[1] Bower is the author of the statement. [2] A mistake: *vide* note *infra*.

[3] Wyntoun and Bower are the authors of the statements.

[4] Boyes suggested this in 1526: there is no contemporary evidence.

[5] Professor Skeat, annotating st. 31, says, "the place described is the royal garden at Windsor." The story about James's courtship at that royal residence, however, is, to

observed that we can date it much more exactly than this. . . . I do not find that any one has noticed a curious expression in stanza 191. The lines to which I allude are the third and fourth of that stanza:

> 'Thankit mot be the sanctis marciall
> That me first causit hath this accident.'

For *marciall* the editions by Tytler and others have *merciall*, and there is no note upon the line; nor does the word appear in Thomson's glossary, so that this interesting point has been missed. The 'Martial Saints' are the saints of the month of Mars, *i.e.* of March; and the poet blesses all the saints of this happy month because it 'first caused him this accident,' *i.e.* was the original cause of his good fortune. I take this to refer, not to his first sight of the lady (which certainly took place in May, as we learn expressly from stanzas 34, 49, and 65), but to the month in which he first quitted his native land; and I think it highly probable that the recurrence of the 12th of March—the anniversary of the day when he first left home, and all his troubles began (see stanza 20)—caused him to turn his thoughts upon the events of his past life."

That narrative is certainly not what might have been expected from an editor writing in 1884, who considered it necessary to tell "the facts that immediately concern the reader of his (James's) chief poem." Professor Skeat has evidently neither troubled himself with the chroniclers nor gathered his facts from the most recent and trustworthy biographers. He has told the story much as Tytler and the earlier editors did, never doubting the perfect agreement of the biography with the poem, and of the poem with the biography.

Now it will be admitted that if James the First was the author of the *Kingis Quair*, no one was so well able as he to tell us all about his capture and long captivity in England. He was present and privy to the things described. The biographical facts which we can test are the three

---

use a phrase of Rabelais, "a fib too fabulous" to be allowed to pass. *Vide* note E, App. p. 159.

made use of by Professor Skeat, viz.—the statements (1) in stanza 20, and (2) in stanza 22, and (3) the curious expression in stanza 191.[1]

Let us begin by quoting stanza 20:

"In vere, that full of vertu is and gude
Quhen nature first begynneth hir emprise,
That quhilum was be cruell frost and flude
And schowris scharp opprest in many wyse
And Synthius begynneth to aryse
Heigh in the est, a morrow soft and suete
Upward his course to driue in Ariete."

Plainly that intimates to us that when the voyage began the sun had entered Aries, which fixes March 11th as the earliest date. As one may read the verse, it suggests that the sun was not just beginning to enter Aries, but was already in it. There is, however, no need to insist on the point; 11th March is sufficient as a date fixed.[2]

Stanza 22 is as follows:

"Noght fer passit the state of Innocence
Bot nere about the nowmer of zeris thre
Was it causit throu hevinly influence
Off Goddis will or othir casualtee
Can I noght say bot out of my contree
By thair avise that had of me the cure
Be see to pas, tuke I myn auenture."

---

[1] The well-known line in stanza 187:

"That from the deth hir man sche has defendit,"

referring to Joan, has often been quoted as prophetical. Professor Skeat says in a note, "By a singular coincidence it was literally true that she defended the king when he was being assassinated." Any divination in the words will be effectually eradicated if it be found that the poem was written *after* 1437. It is always pardonable to disbelieve in prophecy where one can elude its verification as such by ordinary interpretation.

[2] Professor Skeat observes that in Chaucer's time, as shown in his treatise on the Astrolabe, the Vernal Equinox was 12th March; and that "foure greis evin" mentioned in stanza 22, means "four degrees exactly = an hour past midday or 1 o'clock p.m." Mr. W. Peck, City Observatory, Edinburgh, informs me that the Vernal Equinox in 1406 was 11th March, and that "four degrees past midday = 16 minutes past noon is apparent noon, as found from the sun, and according to the language of the fifteenth century."

Now, "nere about the nowmer of zeris thre" past "the state of Innocence" is not difficult to explain, for, in the technical language of the Civilians, a child who could not understand the import of what he did, was spoken of as still *infanti proximus*; but on entering his eighth year, being then considered to have *intellectus*, he was *pubertati proximus*.[1] The state of Innocence therefore means seven years of age, to which fall to be added "nere the nowmer of zeris thre," thus making James "about ten years of age" at the date of his capture.

If again the reference to the "sanctis marciall" points to the month of March as the time of his capture—which, however, I doubt—we have three very definite statements indeed by which to test the poem.

Now, what are the facts? Wyntoun's statement that James was born in 1394 is confirmed by Queen Annabella's letter to Richard II., dated 1st August, 1394, which refers to the birth as having taken place shortly before that date.[2]

In the course of editing the *Exchequer Rolls*, Mr. George Burnett, Lyon King of Scotland, finding it difficult to make certain entries in the Scottish Public Registers agree with some of the statements of the historians, applied to Sir William Hardy, Deputy Keeper of the Records in London.[3] That distinguished archivist, after an exhaustive investigation regarding the date of the prince's capture, and the sums eventually paid

---

[1] *Vide* the Constitution of Theodosius (*Cod. Theod.*, viii. 18. 8). The period of infancy was fixed in accordance with the theory of physicians, who maintained that the human body underwent a marked change every seven years.

See also *Ratis Raving*, Book I., ll. 1112 to 1150, where the "first age" is up to three; "the second" up to seven:

> "The tother eild, I understand
> Is fra thre zer to vii lestand—
> . . . . . .
> This eild is lycht and Innocent
> Suppos it want gud Jugment."

The "third age" is from the seventh to the fifteenth year:

> "Than springis rutis of resone."

[2] *Vide* note *supra*, 130.

[3] *Exchequer Rolls*, Vol. IV., p. cxxxiv. and App. cciii.

towards his ransom, discovered that in *Foedera* (Vol. VIII., pp. 403 to 419) no fewer than fourteen documents had been placed by Rymer under 1405, although belonging to a subsequent year. The errors in the *Foedera*, which had led so many modern historians astray, were detected by examining original documents of apparently similar date at different and distant places.[1] The result, so far as it concerns us at present, is that Wyntoun and Bower are both found to be wrong about the capture of James; the one in placing it among the events of 1404, the other of 1405. It is now known to have been in 1406, the date assigned by the contemporary English chronicler, Walsingham; and the capture does not seem to have taken place in the month of March.

Sir William Hardy's communication, so far as it bears on our subject, may be quoted. It is as follows: "I am at last able to say without possibility of contradiction, that the dates assigned by Rymer to the three documents in which the Earl of Orkney and his brothers are mentioned, viz. Aug. 19 and Sept. 13, 1405 (Vol. VIII., pp. 410-415), are indisputably wrong. The year in which these safe conducts were granted should be 1407 (8 Hen. IV.).

"The question appeared to be of such importance, that I hesitated (until thoroughly satisfied by a careful investigation of the original documents) to assert that more than a dozen of the entries cited by Rymer from the *Rotulus Viagii* as belonging to the 6th of Henry IV., really belong to the 8th year of that king's reign.

"The difficulties (see note in Pinkerton's *History of Scotland*, Vol. I., pp. 81 and 82)[2] which have arisen in consequence of Rymer's error in reconciling the conflicting authorities as to the date of the capture of the Earl of Carric (*i.e.* King James the First) by the English, and the death of Sir David Fleming, will be entirely removed by the rectification of the dates as above, and the accuracy of Walsingham's account (*Ypodigma Neustriae*, p. 418) will be fully established.[3]

---

[1] Bain's *Calendar*, Vol. IV., Pref. xxx.

[2] Pinkerton remarks that "when the materials are so complex and discordant the candour of the reader must be requested" (p. 82).

[3] Two recent English historians, Sir James H. Ramsay and J. H. Wylie, discuss

"From all I have seen, I am inclined to believe that, according to the true date of the documents severally attested by the king, the capture of Prince James preceded only a very short time his father's death on 4th April, 1406.[1] Fleming's death should be placed probably about the middle of February, 1406 (O.S.): this would agree with the Scottish Exchequer account, in which you say he is represented as deceased in March, 1405-6. The prince's imprisonment in the Tower commenced, we may presume, at the end of February or early in March, 1406 (O.S.)."[2]

In the same interesting communication, Sir William Hardy gives a list of payments made to the Constable of the Tower "for the household of the King of Scotland," and concludes that from these "it may be inferred that the Constable of the Tower, Sir Thomas Rempston or his lieutenant, had the charge of the prince and other prisoners from an early day in March, 1406."

But we are able also by means of the amended *Foedera* to negative March, 1405, as the date of the capture. On Palm Sunday in the year 1405 a truce between England and Scotland came to an end.[3] Communications passed between the two Governments as to its renewal, but

---

the point carefully. Ramsay says, "The Scots writers give the year as 1405, but this date is excluded by their own narratives, which show that the capture took place in the year following Northumberland's retreat into Scotland."—*Lancaster and York*, Vol. I., p. 97. Wylie says, "One point, however, may be taken as now fully established, viz. that the Scottish chroniclers, Wyntown and Bower, are wrong in placing the events in 1405, and that the English records are right when they assign them to the earlier months of 1406."—*History of England under Henry IV.*, Vol. II., ch. 61. Rapin correctly gives the year as 1406. The year is 1406 in Boyes; and also in the *Regist. Epis. Glasg.*, p. 316.

[1] *Exchequer Rolls*, *Ib.*, Pref.

[2] The letters O.S., used twice, should be deleted: they are manifestly a slip of the pen, as the whole context shows.

[3] It ended April 19, 1405. I agree with Sir James Ramsay in holding that at the time of James's capture in 1406 "there was no truce worthy of the name between England and Scotland." On 7th February, 1406, Henry empowered his envoys to negotiate "a real truce"; but nothing appears to have resulted. The point, however, is not free from doubt, looking to Walsingham's statement both in his *History* and the *Ypodigma* that a truce actually existed.

not a hint is found in any document of that year about the prince being a prisoner in England.[1] Such references in State papers commence in the early summer of 1406.[2] Again, in the year 1405[3] the Earl of Northumberland with his grandson Percy fled into Scotland after the rebellion in the North which ended with the battle of Shrewsbury. They found refuge at St. Andrews with Bishop Wardlaw, who had then charge of James, and the two youths were for a time educated together.[4] It is therefore absolutely impossible that the capture can have taken place in March, 1405.

When we test the poem in the light of these facts, what is the result? James at the time of his capture was not "nere the nowmer of zeris thre" past "the state of Innocence": he was eleven years and a half. His capture—according to the latest authorities—did not take place in the month of March but in February.[5] It is impossible that his voyage could have commenced on or after March 11th, seeing that he was safely lodged in the Tower of London in February, or, at latest, in the beginning of March.

How do the errors of Wyntoun come to be repeated in the *Kingis Quair*? Surely no one will believe James the First to have been capable of such biographical blunders. May we not say with Emerson that every man should be so much an artist that he could report in conversation what had befallen him?

Can it be that a chronicle has blossomed into the *Kingis Quair*?

---

[1] "Yet it is singular that no mention of the Prince occurs in any writing of that year, *i.e.* 1405."—Pinkerton, p. 82.

[2] *Foedera*, IX.

[3] Northumberland arrived in June, 1405, a date as to which Walsingham is corroborated by the English records, and the period of his residence at St. Andrews must have intervened between that date and the prince's embarkation.—*Exchequer Rolls*, Vol. IV., Pref. xlii.

[4] *Scotichronicon*, B. XV., 18, 19.

[5] Mr. George Burnett says the same thing about February, but I have been unable to discover either his or Sir William Hardy's authority for that month, although I have diligently searched for it. They were both eminently cautious, and must have been satisfied that certain circumstances pointed to the capture having taken place in February.

Is it possible for us to attain to that lofty sight, "where facts yield their secret sense and annals and poetry are alike"? Let us look closely at the *Origynale Cronykil* of Wyntoun,—finished sometime between 3rd September, 1420, and April, 1424—and compare some passages with the *Kingis Quair*. In the *Cronykil* (B. IX., c. 25) we are told when James set sail from the Bass, that

> "he wes there purvait wele."

In the *Kingis Quair* the same incident is referred to thus:

> 23. "Purvait of all that was us necessary."

So again in the *Cronykil* we learn that Robert III. deliberated

> "Be prevé counsale and ordinance"

to send the prince into France, and that he and his retinue

> "In to that schip then maid entré
> In till intent to pas the sé."

In the *Kingis Quair* the poet says:

> "Out of my contree
> By thair avise that had of me the cure
> Be see to pas, tuke I myn auenture."

Do we not seem to catch a glimpse of the poet—his elbow on the desk, the *Origynale Cronykil* open before him, selecting the few biographical facts needed to lend an air of reality to the good matter he had then in his heart to indite touching the Scottish king? Is it not remarkable to find the chronicler and the poet both falling into the same errors, and at the same time, on the only points where comparison is possible, using identical phrases? Book IX., chapter 25, of Wyntoun's *Cronykil* was certainly written years before James returned to Scotland:[1] surely no one will venture even to suggest, much less maintain, that James the First was dependent for his biography on the *Cronykil*!

---

[1] The chronicle was *finished* between 3rd September, 1420, and the return of James I. in April, 1424, as appears by Robert Duke of Albany being mentioned as dead, and the prayer for the prosperity of his children in B. IX., c. 26.—*Vide* Dr. David Laing's edition of Wyntoun *Historians of Scotland*, Vol. II., Pref. xxxiv.).

A REVIEW AND CONCLUSION.

OUR survey now is ended. Are we able by a process of exclusion and rejection to arrive at an inevitable conclusion? A verdict of Not Proven, with the jarring noise that usually follows, is undesirable and to be avoided if possible.

In coming to a decision, I venture to think the judgment of most men will be held captive, at the outset, by a certain prepossession for James. Among the bards he stands in the front rank—

> "As in a globe of radiant fire and graced
> To be in that orb crowned, that doth include
> Those prophets of the former magnitude
> And he one chief."

Primer and text book have taught us to regard him as "the best poet among kings and the best king among poets," as "a royal poet on whose character royalty itself could scarcely confer any additional splendour," and as "the agent who in all probability established the influence of Chaucer as predominant in the literature of his native land." In compliment to him, the seven-line stanza employed in the *Kingis Quair*—although really Chaucerian—is now known as "the rime royal"; while the poem itself has been criticized as a work "full of simplicity and feeling, and not inferior in poetical merit to any similar production of Chaucer." Nor can we forget how Rossetti in *The King's Tragedy*, one of the best of modern ballads, has worked up into weird beauty the sad story of the tragic death of the king, weaving into it many verses of the *Kingis Quair*—"that lovely poem" as he calls it,

> "More sweet than ever a poet's heart,
> Gave yet to the English tongue."

Not willingly therefore, having all these things in remembrance, will any one deprive James of his singing garment and reduce him to the humbler rank of a King of Scots. Yet that is what must happen if we decide that he did not write the *Kingis Quair*.

The encomiastic criticisms just quoted belong to comparatively recent times. They have been put forth quite regardless of the fact that the belated bequest which came by John Major has been slowly but surely proving a veritable *hereditas damnosa*. Both *Peebles to the Play* and *Christ's Kirk on the Green* are now relegated to the anonymous poetry of the sixteenth century—inexorably deposed by the internal evidence. *Yas sen*, notwithstanding Pinkerton's bold attempt at identification by "melting liquid letters, torturing mutes to make them speak, and making vowels dumb," is still unknown, and on the *Kingis Quair* alone, of all Major's *codices plurimi*, the poetical fame of James must now stand or fall. With that grave issue clearly before us, we shall now proceed to review very briefly the evidence adduced.

And first, it will be proper to glance at the case for James. It rests, so far as the historical evidence is concerned, practically on the Bodleian manuscript alone; for Professor Skeat, it will be remembered, has admitted the testimony of John Major, as regards the vernacular poems, to be "almost worthless at best," adding at the same time, that "the wonder is that he is right about the *Kingis Quair* itself." But when we ask what is the internal evidence that makes for James being the author of the poem, it is not easy to furnish an answer. Reading the *Introduction* in the Scottish Text Society edition, one is forced to the conclusion that the editor, never having had a doubt about the authorship, has, instead of examining the evidence, affirmed from the beginning. Like the earlier editors, he begins with an epitome of the leading biographical facts concerning James. Aware that the prince's age at the time of his capture is stated differently by different biographers, he takes, without availing himself of the most recent historical criticism, the commonly accepted date, 1405. Finding it to accord with the statement in the poem that James was about ten years of age at the time, he then advances beyond any earlier editor, and boldly citing passages, "hitherto unobserved," to strengthen the autobiography, ventures even to suggest the very months of the year 1423 in which the poem was composed. Here are the passages: "I have already said that the poem of the *Kingis Quair*, that is, of the King's Book, was composed in

1423. I do not find that it has been observed that we can date it much more exactly than this. A careful study of the poem has led me to believe that it was probably not composed quite all at once; indeed a poem of 1379 lines must have occupied several days at least, and even at the rate of fifty lines a day would have taken up nearly a month. . . . It is further clear that the composition of the poem must have lasted into June, since after seeing the lady Joan in May he speaks of his hopes increasing 'day by day' (st. 181), of his 'long pain and true service in love' (st. 188), which led to his love being reciprocated, of his 'long and true continuance in love and true service' (st. 192), and of his further success in love 'day by day' (st. 193). Indeed, if we are to take the words in the *literal* sense, we should have to allow even a still later date for the latter portion of the poem; but perhaps a month or six weeks may fairly be considered a long term of service to a lover who is anxious for the success of his suit."

It was surely such kind of deductive criticism that Montaigne had in his mind when he wrote—"Who will not say that glosses augment doubts and ignorance, since there's no one book to be found, either human or divine, which the world busies itself about whereof the difficulties are cleared by interpretation? The hundredth commentator passes it on to the next more knotty and perplexed than he found it."

When he proceeds to the criticism of the text, Professor Skeat tells us that he was startled to find James abandoning the grammar used in the Lowlands of Scotland, and attempting to imitate all the inflections of the Midland dialect of Chaucer. Clearly enough the instances of false accidence perpetrated by the author in attempting to imitate Chaucer[1] did not suggest the contradiction which these implied of the statements of both English and Scottish chroniclers, that James while in captivity

---

[1] *Vide* notes *supra*, pp. 108, 109, and 113. Professor Skeat cites the line in stanza 27,

"And I a man, and lakkith libertee,"

as a curious instance of confusion of grammar. "Lakkith," however, is not used here with the first personal pronoun, but *intransitively*, as in stanza 84. The poet is simply saying, "*Liberty is lacking.*"

received the best education that England could then give. Neither can the tender age of the prince at the time of his capture have been sufficiently considered, else the presence of Northern dialect in the poem, and the subsidiary use of Midland speech, would surely have startled an editor who had properly taken his bearings. Or, if the use made of the Croydon charter is to be taken as showing that the editor did attempt to account for the Northern dialect in the poem, then, indeed, the very nature of the document itself, the age of the prince at the time it purported to be executed, and the circumstances attending the grant to Sir William Douglas, ought to have been sufficient to give pause before it was founded on as a voucher for James's ability to compose in the vernacular speech of Lowland Scotland.

So, too, as regards the Chaucerian imitations. These were obvious to Tytler, though he only troubled himself to note a few of them, leaving to later editors the completion of the list. They furnish no proof whatever for or against James as the author of the poem. But Tytler, as we saw, noted stanzas of the *Kingis Quair* modelled on the *Court of Love*. Like every critic of that time, he believed the *Court of Love* to be a genuine Chaucerian poem, and the discovery of imitated passages consequently pointed to no conclusion against James as the author. In the case of Professor Skeat it is very different. He knew that the *Court of Love* was not Chaucer's, and that it belonged to a time later than the age of James. But unfortunately he believed James to be the author of the *Kingis Quair* —a belief that evidently prevented him from collating the poems and verifying the observation of the earliest editor. The consequence is, that the claim for the king rests solely on romantic as distinguished from historical criticism.

If we suppose our standpoint to be that of an editor coming now to weigh the evidence for the first time, is there any one so bold as to assert that James would be named as the author? The Bodleian manuscript —half a century at least later than the reign of James—breaks down altogether under fair and ordinary tests, its false ascriptions numbering at least one half of the whole. John Major—a sixteenth century historian, writing eighty-four years after the death of the king—is found in the very

passage in which the *Kingis Quair* is attributed to James, to be indisputably untrustworthy about the other vernacular poems. But the historical evidence must also take account of Walter Bower, William Dunbar, and Sir David Lindsay. Bower, the sole contemporary, and for that reason, in a strict sense, the only competent witness, must be held to be against James. In the minutely particular description, he has attributed to the king more "virtues" than any one man ever possessed—many of them insignificant enough taken alone—yet, although taking care to preserve a specimen of Latin versification, he nowhere suggests that James wrote vernacular poetry. So too, Dunbar, in a deliberate survey of the whole field of Scottish poetry, omits all mention of the ancestor of his patron, James the Fourth: while Lindsay—who had lauded James V. as a poet—in a poem that certainly gave him the opportunity of naming James the First in company with the eight makars singled out for praise, is also silent. The plain inference surely is that Bower, Dunbar, and Lindsay were not aware that James the First had written vernacular poetry. They are to be regarded as witnesses—qualified to speak with authority—who in giving evidence have significantly testified against the king by omitting all mention of his name as a Scottish makar.

When we come to the *Kingis Quair* itself, and find it in part modelled on the *Court of Love*—a poem written not earlier than 1440—what is there to be said? Some of the passages have been quoted; so too we have pointed out the tell-tale error in both poems concerning the "smaragde," and the use of the uncommon word "balas"; but the question at issue, viz. Had the author of the *Kingis Quair* the *Court of Love* in his view? —is one of fact to be determined by a jury of wise men: the opinion of one man, I am well aware, cannot decide it. If it be answered affirmatively, an inevitable conclusion will have been reached.

The remaining questions—the dialect, and the biography in the poem —are less complex. Indeed, to a mind of ordinary sagacity, neither presents much difficulty. The dialect and the biographical facts which condition it have already been discussed in considering the case for James assumed by Professor Skeat. But it must not be overlooked that if we find the *Kingis Quair* to be partly modelled on the *Court of Love*, then

the former poem at once becomes one of the group of Scottish poems exhibiting the same artificial dialect, written between 1440 and 1480, when there was a vogue among Scottish poets to engraft Midland inflexions on the Northern dialect. Such reconciling criticism, besides, will go far to explain away the paradox of a poem—unquestionably marked by many puzzling and conflicting characteristics of grammar and dialect—failing so utterly to conform to the admitted tests of language devised by philology for the period to which hitherto, without due examination of its credentials, it has been supposed to belong.[1]

Coming now to the biography, or rather the autobiography—for it must be tested as such—plainly in the poem, we are told that James was about ten years of age when captured by the English; that his voyage began on or after 11th March; that he was taken prisoner in that month; and that his captivity endured for eighteen years. These facts accord with Wyntoun's *Cronykil*, and between the poem and the chronicle there is verbal agreement in passages referring to the same incidents, pointing to the chronicle—the earlier in date—having been consulted by the poet. The bare suggestion that James should have required to refer to a chronicle for biographical facts is of itself sufficiently ludicrous. But when we find that poem and chronicle are both alike wrong in fact—that James was not ten but eleven and a half years old when captured, and that his voyage was probably ended and himself in the Tower of London before 11th March—the question assumes another aspect. To be able to show that the biographical incidents are copied, as regards the diction, from the *Cronykil*, goes far to prove that James was not the author; when, however, we destroy the poem altogether as an autobiographical document, it is surely as near to demonstration as we could ever hope to attain by interrogating circumstances after the lapse of well-nigh five centuries.

In setting out to review the evidence, I referred to the predilection that most men might be expected to have for the poet-king. As a closing word, however, it seems well to point out that the question we are con-

---

[1] *Vide* Note C, App. p. 154.

sidering, so far as it concerns James's right to rank among the national poets, is really of secondary importance. The main question is whether the *Kingis Quair* was written in the first quarter of the fifteenth century or at a later time. If it be found to belong to the second half of that century —as I believe it will—then we shall also have discovered what is of great importance, namely, that hitherto in the criticism of the poetical literature of the period between the time of Chaucer and the advent of our Scottish Spenser, Robert Henryson, the literary compass has been seriously deflected. A true adjustment of the needle may perhaps not lead to new discoveries speedily and suddenly, but to the future voyager it will at least give hope, the best incentive to continued investigation. Emancipation from error is the condition of all progress.

NOTE A.

THE BODLEIAN MS., ARCH. SELD. B. 24.

Many readers, I believe, will be glad to have an epitome of the contents of the Bodleian MS., so well known by its catalogue reference, Arch. Selden B. 24. The transcript, which I obtained through the kindness of the Rev. W. D. Macray of the Bodleian Library, was made for me by Miss Angelina F. Parker, 39 Wellington Square, Oxford, who also most obligingly sent me a tracing of the Gaelic lines occurring on folio 231 and a drawing of the shield emblazoned on fol. 118 at the end of the *Troilus*. It is a pleasure to acknowledge the services of one who has been so very helpful.

In the case of the longer poems in the MS., the first and last lines are noted: where the piece consists of one verse, the first line only is given. In every instance the colophon is copied as it appears in the MS. The asterisk denotes the reference "folio-verso." I have also given, at the end of the contents, certain memoranda made by early owners of the MS. Generally speaking, such jottings are scornfully referred to by editors of early texts as "idle scribblings," and, being despised, are rarely noted at all in the printed volume. In tracing the pedigree of a MS., however, such "scribblings" may easily come to be of the greatest value, and in every case they ought, in my opinion, to accompany a critical text, even if they be relegated to the last page and be there printed only in diamond italics.

The volume most probably belonged at one time to the Sinclair family, judging from the note on folio 230, "liber Henrici Dmi. Sinclair," and the

signatures, Maurius, Laurence, Maluin, and Elizabeth Sinclair. With a little trouble, I daresay, one might identify all the individuals, but I have not leisure to make the attempt at present.

In the MS. at folio 118 there is a Norman-shaped shield, which Miss Parker thus describes: Azure quarterly, first and fourth in bordure, or, each bearing a galley, or, with sail argent displayed, second and third each a galley, or, with sails argent unfurled, shield in fesse, or, in bordure and cross paté sable.

Under two lines of Gaelic, written in Old Irish character, on folio 231, there occurs the signature, "Mig Domnall Gorm." I take it to designate the Laird of Sleat, who, on 21st July, 1614, obtained confirmation of a charter of lands in Benbecula containing the curious clause, "proviso quod castrum de Camys semper pateret regi regisque locum-tenentibus, et camerariis: proviso quod dicte 40 solidate nullo pacto disponerentur hominibus insulanis *lie hielandmen* nisi prius dicto Don. oblate essent" (*Reg. Mag. Sig.* 1609-1620, No. 1087; also Vol. XIII. (1622-35) of the *Privy Council Registers*).

The signature or inscription, "Channois, 1592," may also indicate that the MS. was for a time in France; but judging from the bucolic memoranda on the margin at folio 229, in which occur the words, "the 4 day of May Threscor and ten," the volume was in Scotland in 1570.

In an interesting letter which appeared in the *Athenaeum* of 28th December, 1895, Mr. Mark Liddell called attention to the memorandum on folio 119.[1] After pointing out that the MS. must have been written subsequent to 1488, he adds that "this entry furnishes direct evidence as to the time and place of the birth of James IV., the date of which has been variously stated (see *Accounts of the L. H. Treasurer of Scotland*, I. p. xlv. note)." To Mr. Liddell belongs the honour of the discovery of John Walton as the author of the little poem on folio 119,

"Richt as pouert causith sobirness."

The lines occur as part of the Prologue (vv. 83-90) to Walton's translation of Boethius' *de Consolatione*.

The manuscript appears to have been written by three scribes, thus: (*a*) folios 1-191; (*b*) folios 192-209 (but query); (*c*) folios 209*-228*; (*d*) folios 229 and 229* in hand (*b*); (*e*) folios 230-231 in hand (*c*).

The *Parliament of Fowls* in this MS. omits lines 601 to the end, and inserts an ending of its own. Against these verses is written in pencil, "Fresh, unique ending, spurious, F"—the note probably being Dr. Furnivall's.

---

[1] See note *supra*, p. 96.

Fol. 1. The double sorowe of Troylus to tellen
That was the king Priamus sone of Troye[1]

. . . . . .

Fol. 118*. Here endeth the book of Troylus of double sorowe inloving of Cris. . . .
Blak be thy bandis and thy wedes
Thou sorowfull book of mater disesparit
In tokenying of thyne inward mortall wo
Quhiche is so bad that may not noght bene enparit
Thou oughtest neuer outward bene enfarit
That hast within so many a soroufull cl. . . .
Suich be thyne habyte as thou hast thy . . .[2]

Fol. 119. Flee from the press and duell with suthfastness

. . . . . .

Explicit Chaucere*s* counsailing.

Fol. 119. Richt as pouert causith sobirness.

. . . . . .

Quod Chaucere.

Fol. 119*. Deuise prowes and eke humylitee

. . . . . .

Fol. 120. Quod Chaucere quhen he was ryght auisit.

Nativitas principis nostri Jacobi quarti anno domini M^mo^ iiij^c^ lxxij^o^ xvij die mensis marcij videlicet in festo sancti Patricij confessoris, In monasterio sancte crucis prope Edinburgh.

Fol. 120*. In Maye quhan Flora the fresche lusty quene

. . . . . .

Fol. 129*. Here endith the maying and disport of Chaucere.

Fol. 130. Moder of god and virgyne undefouled
Fol. 131*. Explicit oracio Galfridi Chaucere.

---

[1] There is no heading in the MS. to this poem of Troilus and Criseyde. Several of the pages have beautifully illuminated borders and capital letters. There are a great many marginal notes, mostly in different hands from the text.

[2] Who is the author of this verse? At folio 33*, *Troilus*, Book II., l. 1274, under "thornes" in the text is written "thorne" by another hand. At the head of many of the pages, the number of the book is given "liber primus," "liber secundus," etc. There are very few corrections in the text of this or any of the other poems in the MS.

Fol. 132. Gladith ze foules of the morow gay.

. . . . . .

Fol. 134. And god geue euery wight Joy of his make.
The compleynt of Mars
The ordour of compleynt requirith skilfully

. . . . . .

Fol. 136. Kithith therfor to hir sum kyndness.

Fol. 136. The compleynt of Venus folowith.
There nys none so hie confort to my plesance

. . . . . .

Fol. 137. Off Graunsoun the best that makith france
Quod Galfridus Chaucere.

Fol. 137*. Oh hie Emperice and quene celestial

. . . . . .

Fol. 138. Eternaly abufe all erdly wicht
Quod Chaucere.

Fol. 138. This warldly Joy is onely fantasy [One verse.]

. . . . . .

Leaulte vault richesse.

Fol. 138*. The Lord of loue crie benedicitee[1]

. . . . . .

Fol. 152. To full cownyng I can nought cum, suppose I rede all zere
Here endis the parliament of foulis.
Quod Galfride Chaucere.

Fol. 152*. Here begynnis the legendis of ladyes
A thowsand tymes haue I herd men telle.

. . . . . .

Fol. 161. Here endis the prolog of the legendis of good wommen.

Fol. 161. After the deth of Tholome the king

. . . . . .

Fol. 162*. Here endis the legend of Cleopatra.

---

[1] A leaf is wanting before the *Parliament of Fowls*, which begins on folio 142 with "off vsage olde quhat for loue quhat for lore."

Fol. 163. At Babylon quhilom fell It thus

. . . . . .

Fol. 165*. Here endis the legend of Priam*us* and Tisbe.

Fol. 166. Glory and hono*ur* Virgile Mantoan

. . . . . .

Fol. 172. Here endis the legend of Dido the quene.

Fol. 172*. Thou rote of fals*e* louer*es* duc Jason

. . . . . .

Fol. 176*. Here endis the legend of Isiphile and Medea.

Fol. 177. Now mote I seyne the exiling of kingis

. . . . . .

Fol. 180. Here endis the legend of Lucres.

Fol. 180. Juge Infernall Mynos of Crete King

. . . . . .

Fol. 185. Here endis the legend of Adriane.

Fol. 185. Thou gevar*e* of the formes th*a*t has wro*ught*

. . . . . .

Fol. 187*. Here endis the legend of Proigen and Philomene.

Fol. 187. I proue as wele as by autoritee

. . . . . .

Fol. 191*. This tale is seid to this conclusion
And thus ended Chaucere the legendis of ladyis.

Fol. 191. Heireefter followis the quair Maid be King James of scotland ye first callit ye Kingis quair and Maid quhen his Ma. wes in Ingland.

Fol. 192. Heigh in the hevy*n*nis figure circulere
The rody sterres twynklyng as the fyre

. . . . . .

Fol. 211. And eke thair saulis vnto ye bliss of hevin
Amen.

Explicit, etc. etc. etc.
Quod Jacobus p*r*imus scotor*um* rex Illustrissimus.

Fol. 211*. Cupido vnto quhois *com*mandement

. . . . . .

Fol. 217. A thousand foure hundreth and secund, etc.
Explicit, etc.

Fol. 217. Befor my deth this lay of sorow I sing

. . . . . .

Fol. 219. Of fair langage to all ye worldis ere.
Explicit, etc.

Fol. 219. Becaus*e* that teres weyme*n*ting and playntee

. . . . . .

Fol. 220. I will proceid thareof to the endite.
Explicit Prologus.

Fol. 220. Quho may compleyne my langoure and distress*e*.

. . . . . .

Fol. 221*. Here endis the lufaris complaynt, etc.

Fol. 221*. Hare begi*n*nith ye quare of Jelusy.
Arise *ze* gudely folk*es* and see
This lusty man the quhich all tend*er* flour*es*.

. . . . . .

Fol. 225. Heireeftir folowis the trety In the reprefe of Jelousye,
The passing Clerk the grete philosophoure.

. . . . . .

Fol. 228*. In body and soule eternaly mot Duell.
Explicit q*uod* Auchē.[1] . . .

Fol. 229. My frende gif thou will be a *ser*uitur*e*.

. . . . . .

Fol. 229*. Quho lefte here Craft*es*. . . .
(E)plicit.

Fol. 229*. Man be als mery as th . . [One and a half verses.]
And lat no*ugh*t many . . .

---

[1] Supposed to indicate James Auchinleck (Scotice, Affleck), one of the makars named in Dunbar's *Lament*.

Fol. 230. . . . . a hors of gold yow.[2] . .

[2] This poem is in a later hand, very badly written and illegible in places. The words

". . . hors of gold yow go,
Half pite of me catif bound and thrall"

precede these lines and are deleted in the MS.

. . . . I suffir panes sare
. . . . sweit hart . . .
. . . . . .
O lady faire in quhom is myn e. . . .
Fol. 231. Hef piete of me catif bound and thrall.

NOTES ON THE MS.

The following signatures and notes occur in the manuscript, each in a different handwriting:

Fol. 79, "Mauius Synclar." Fol. 155, "Be me Edward Walker." Fol. 229, "Agnes Findlason * wt my hand"; "Mr. John Duncan wt my hand"; "A Findlason *" (same hand). Fol. 230, "Williame . . ."; "be me patrik schiner"; "Villam Lord (?)"; "Be me Donald . . ."; "liber Henrici dmi Sinclar"; "Omnibus hanc cartam, viz." (*repeated four times*), "Be me Laurence Sincla . . . Gif that in Wertew . . . ow ta . . ."

There are several other signatures on folio 230, but they are all illegible. One looks like "Maluin Sin . . ." Another is "James, James (?)." "domine dominus noster quem admir . . . est . . ." On folio 231, "Villem Crisseance is me name.' "Elezabeth synclar within . . ." On folio 231, ". . . send . . . saulle to ane guid end O Lord." "Jeff (?) Sinclar": then follow two lines in Gaelic with the signature "Mig Domnall Gorm."[1] On the same page in a large hand, "Channois 1592" (or *Chaunois*). On folio 229 is this note in the margin: Vpone the sext day of May . . . Villiam Latt . . . Jhone quhyt . . . akre and Villiam brabiner . . . In the 3 croft fald. Vpone the seuenth day of June pryst be Jeames . . . patrik chapmane and Jhone chapman. . . . In the third croftfald . . . Vpon the acht day off May prist be Jhone Gib patrick chapmane and Jeames. . . . In the third cropfald fyv . . . Item 40 heid off catell upone the 15 day off May. Iteme upon the 4 day of maij Threscor and ten, Ine the lach . . . and the third cropfald Villame smyth and . . . and ane stirk off four zeiris old acht nicht. In the hender end of maij and the beg . . . off June upone the sext day of June In my third crop fald a . . . scoir sheip. (This note is very badly written, and illegible in places.)

[1] The Gaelic lines, as far as they can be deciphered, appear to be,

"... r ... c ... oc na coinne don bioth air luiam a duille.
Laimh ri linne fuair sinne air clar na cruinne." "Mise Domnall Gorm."

They appear to be seven syllabled; if written out in stanza, three syllables would require to be supplied in the first and third lines. This tentative translation has been furnished to me by my friend the Rev. Robert Blair, D.D., Edinburgh, who worked from a very rough tracing. "On meeting her on the bareness of her leaves, we found it by the side of the linn on the flat ground."

NOTE B.

JOHN MAJOR'S TESTIMONY.

"In vernacula lingua artificiosissimus compositor: cujus codices plurimi et cantilenae memoriter adhuc apud Scotos inter primos habentur. Artificiosum libellum de regina dum captivus erat composuit, antequam eam in conjugem duceret: et aliam artificiosam cantilenam ejusdem, *Yas sen* etc. et jucundum artificiosumque illum cantum *At Beltayn* etc. quem alii de Dalketh et Gargeil mutare studuerunt: quia in arce aut camera clausus servabatur in qua mulier cum matre habitabat."—Major, *De Gestis Scotorum*, fol. cxxxv. Paris, 1521.

Mr. Archibald Constable translates the passage thus: "When he wrote the language of his own country he showed the utmost ability of that sort. He left behind him many writings and songs, which are to this day remembered amongst the Scots, and reckoned to be the best they have. He wrote an ingenious little book about the queen while he was yet in captivity and before his marriage, and likewise another ingenious ditty of the same kind, *Yas sen*, etc., and that pleasant and ingenious poem *At Beltayn*, etc., upon which other writers of Dalkeith and Gargeil laid themselves out to make some change,—because he was at that time kept a prisoner in the castle, where the lady dwelt with her mother, or even in his own chamber."—*History of Greater Britain*, by John Major, Scot. Hist. Society, Vol. x., p. 366.

§ 1. My translation of the same passage at p. 101 may be compared with Mr. Constable's; between the two there is essential agreement. The one point of difficulty is in the rendering of the words *quem alii de Dalketh et Gargeil mutare studuerunt.* Mr. Constable's version, *supra*, and my own—"which certain persons of Dalkeith and Gargeil have tried to alter"—have this to recommend them, that each takes the words *mutare studuerunt* in their primary sense.

Following Sibbald (*Chron. of Scot. Poetry*, Vol. I., p. 137, note), Professor Skeat renders *mutare* as 'to parody,' which is rather more a secondary sense of the word. But I am not prepared to maintain that one of the translations is preferable to another: every translator will please himself.

§ 2. In arguing against *Peebles to the Play* as a poem by James I., Sibbald quoted the passage in Major, and interpreted it in such a way as to show that he entirely misapprehended its meaning. His mistake arose through his failure to note the parenthetical nature of the sentence. He says (*Chron. ib.*), "From this" [*i.e.* the passage in Major] "we may gather that the subject of the poem, *At Beltayn*, was the *confinement* of a person, otherwise there would not have been that correspondence between the original and the parodies which Major

particularly specifies. The occasion or subject of the parodies, he seems to say, was *by reason of his having been shut up in a tower or chamber in which a woman resided with her mother.*" Professor Skeat differs from Sibbald; but in avoiding Scylla he goes straight for Charybdis. In the introduction to the *Kingis Quair* (p. 19) he says: "Now, the testimony of Mair tells almost as much *against* the authenticity of this poem (*i.e. Peebles to the Play*) as in its favour. James's poem, he says, was not to be got at, but was kept somewhere in safe custody; on which account others of 'Dalketh and Gargeil' endeavoured to write substitutes for it, and, of course, would begin with the two words by which it seems to have been known. This is what I understand by Mair's remark, taking *cantus* as the implied nominative case to *servabatur*, in opposition to Sibbald's remark that 'the occasion or subject of the parodies was *by reason of his having been shut up in a tower or chamber in which a woman resided with her mother.*'"

When the whole passage is read carefully, there can be no difficulty about the meaning. Major, in short, is telling us that James, before his marriage and while in captivity, wrote certain vernacular poems *while immured in the castle where Joan dwelt with her mother.* To read the passage either as Sibbald or Professor Skeat does is to reduce it to absolute nonsense.

§ 3. One wonders if Major's meaning as regards the words *quem alii de Dalketh et Gargeil mutare studuerunt* may not be that certain persons endeavoured to make the *At Beltayn* poem relate to Dalkeith and Gargeil. The only Gargeil I have been able to discover is a small estate in Stirlingshire which belonged in the fifteenth century to a branch of the Drummond family (abstract of the Stirling Protocols: *Northern Notes and Queries*, January, 1896), but it does not seem to me likely to be the place indicated. If, however, we regard *Gargeil* as one of the numerous typographical errors in Major's *History*, and read *Cargill*, we find a certain connection between that place and Beltane ceremonies. In Jamieson's *Dictionary*, *voce* Beltane, there occurs the note: "A curious monument of the worship of the heavenly bodies still remains in the parish of Cargill, Perthshire. Near the village of Cargill may be seen erect stones of considerable magnitude, having the figure of the moon and stars cut on them, and which are probably the rude remains of pagan superstition. The corn field where these stones stand is called the moon-shade to this day (*Statistical Account*, 1793, Vol. XIII., 536, note)." In Perthshire the Beltane merrymakings continued down to a comparatively recent date. This, however, does not help to an understanding of the reference to Dalkeith. I frankly confess that the words are meaningless to me, whether the reference be to persons or to places.

NOTE C.

ON THE DIALECT AND GRAMMAR OF THE *KINGIS QUAIR.*

In discussing the diction of the *Kingis Quair*, reference was made to the group of Scottish poems that exhibit the strange admixture of Northern and Midland dialect. I selected as specimens *The Romaunt of the Rose* (Fragment B), *The Court of Love*, and *Lancelot of the Lak*; but it may be well to direct special attention to a poem of 607 lines found in the Bodleian MS., Arch. Seld. B. 24, folio 221, viz.: *The Quare of Jelusy*. The colophon ascribes it to "James Auchē . . . ," the latter portion of the name of the author unfortunately being illegible. For more than half a century it has been accepted as a work of James Auchinleck (*Scottice* Affleck), one of the poets referred to in Dunbar's *Lament for the Makars*—

> "That scorpion fell has done infek
> Maister Johne Clerk and James Afflek
> Fra ballat making and tragedie
> Timor mortis conturbat me."

Affleck is identified with James Auchlek, a licentiate or graduate of Glasgow University in 1471, who became "secretar to the Earl of Rosse." He is referred to in the Privy Seal Register as dead about September, 1497. The point is that he flourished in the second half of the fifteenth century.

When the poem is examined we find:

1. That the dialect employed is substantially the same as that of the *Kingis Quair*. The suggestion of artificiality is indeed far stronger in the *Quare of Jelusy* than in the *Kingis Quair*. (*a*) There are infinitives in *yn*, e.g. *enduryn*, *takyn*, *chesyn*, *drinkyn*, *pleasyn*, *syttyn*, answering exactly to the occasional infinitive in *en* in the *Kingis Quair*: there are participles galore like *ybrocht*, *ywrocht*, *yslawe*, *ymarterit*, *y'brent*, etc.

2. That the so-called Chaucerian inflexions, supposed by Professor Skeat to require the sounding of final *e* in the *Kingis Quair*, are also in the *Quare of Jelusy*. I select a few specimen lines from the latter poem, italicizing words on all fours with those for which, in the *Kingis Quair*, Professor Skeat postulates, for scansion, a final *e*:

Line 17. "Bot walking furth vpoun the *new* grene."
„ 63. "So sudaynly vnder zour *strong* lowe."
„ 67. "The *scharp* deth mote perce me throuch the hert."
„ 101. "To *sene* from hir lusty eyne auaille."

Line 119. "Quhich to my *hert* sat full very nere."
„ 138. "Quhich fynd in to his cherlisch *hert* my*ch*t."
„ 250. "Now all hath fele of *thilke* poysoun."
„ 300. "For as we may in *old* bukis fynd."
„ 533. "O *nyce* foole, thine owin harm for to schew."

I have purposely selected instances of the use of identical words singled out for comment by Professor Skeat in his introduction to the *Kingis Quair*, pp. xxvii.-xxxi.

I content myself with simply calling attention to the fact that there is here also perfect agreement between the *Kingis Quair* and the *Quare of Jelusy*. On the *e* test, the correspondence between this poem and the *Kingis Quair* appears to be absolute.

3. That the *e* syllable in the middle of a word is also found, *e.g.*

Line 428. "Efter his deth he come to *Jugement*."=(judg-e-ment.)
„ 520. "Rest nor quyet *treuly* to conclud*e*."=(treu-e-ly.)

4. That *is* and the less common *es* sometimes form distinct syllables, *e.g.*

Line 21. "Makith his course doun by a *woddis* syde."
„ 185. "And of my *termes* and my rude endite."

5. That participles in *ing* abound, and the verbs in the 3rd person pres. ind. end usually in *th* and *ith*, as distinguished from the Northern *is* and *s*.

6. That (*a*) the article *ane* is found before a consonant; (*b*) participles in *it* abound; (*c*) the pronouns *thaim* and *thair* are used, never *hem* or *hir*; (*d*) the verb *to do* is employed in the strong conjugation; (*e*) *ne*=*not* and *nor*, is frequent; (*f*) one remarks the word *tone* also found in *Lancelot of the Lak*; (*g*) the rimes are, I believe, Northern rimes throughout, and mostly after the Northern fashion of ignoring the final *e*. Words are rimed which Chaucer never admitted.

The *Quare of Jelusy* is printed in the *Bannatyne Miscellany*, Vol. II., p. 161 (Bannatyne Club), from a transcription made by Dr. David Laing, and being thus easily accessible, the critic who is interested in the dialect can read it for himself and compare it with the *Kingis Quair*.

If the *Kingis Quair* standing alone present anomalies in dialect and grammar, these without doubt become much less unintelligible when found elsewhere. The vogue of imitation in fifteenth century Scottish literature, seen somewhat at large in *The Romaunt of the Rose*, *The Court of Love*, and *Lancelot of the Lak*, comes out very strongly and very closely alongside the *Kingis Quair*, in a poem like the *Quare of Jelusy*. The latter poem contains admirable illustrations of almost every seeming specialty of dialect and grammar commented on by

Professor Skeat as virtually peculiar to the *Kingis Quair*. The whole stress of his editing was expended on the resuscitation of a putative buried *e*. But the very phenomena which by that method he sought to explain, have to be explained also in the *Quare of Jelusy*. And not one but many such coincidences in grammar and diction are in like case. They have not been explained by analogies from the early post-Chaucerian age, nor will they be understood except by a rectified literary chronology of the whole cycle.

NOTE D.

THE "COURT OF LOVE" AND THE "KINGIS QUAIR."[1]

STANZA OF K. Q.	"KINGIS QUAIR": compare with	STANZA OF C. OF L.	"COURT OF LOVE."
1 to 41	*Vide* stanza 17, "Help Calyope." The mythological *personae* in both poems may be noted generally.	3	Calliope.
42	"Ar ye a warldly creature": "or heavinly thing"?	118	"She seemed lich a thing celestial."
46 to 50	Joan is described.	116 to 119	Rosial is described. *Vide* also stanza 12.

[1] These poems may also be compared with Lydgate's *Temple of Glas*, edited by Dr. Schick (E. E. T. S. edition).

A OF Q.	"KINGIS QUAIR": compare with	STANZA OF C. OF L.	"COURT OF LOVE."
	"thir versis sevin," *i.e.* st. 52. The Scottish poet sums all in the one stanza of seven lines. Compare the two closing lines with the closing lines of stanza 129 of the *Court of Love.*	120 to 129	Philogenet's "bille" consists of *seven* stanzas. Note that stanza 128 does not fit the theme of the *Kingis Quair*, James being in ward and unable to hold converse with any one. This renders it necessary for the Scottish poet to make James visit the Court of Venus in a trance, and accounts for many differences in the handling of the themes of the two poems.
77	These are much reminiscent of Chaucerian poems.		
82	The groups of lovers are described: (1) Lovers with hoary heads, (2) young lovers, (3) people with wide capes with hoods hanging over their eyes, (4) a warld of folke with discontented looks. The *personae* are quite different from any in the Chaucerian poems.		
85	The first group (the agit folk) were those who throughout life had been true to Venus: in the same company are the true warriors and poets.	16 18 34 36	"And agit eke," etc. There saints, etc.; saints = martyrs for love. Many a prince, etc. Lo Yonder Folk, etc. Blue is the colour of steadfastness.
87	The second group (zonge folkes) are those who died in middle age from divers causes: some because bereft of their love, some in arms for their lady's sake, some of despair, some for desire, some for despite, etc.	16	Young men fele came forth.
d 89	The third group (the religious folk), false to their vows of chastity.	37 157	Yea than quoth I what do these prestes here, etc. "This is the Court of lusty folk and gladde," etc. *Note.*—With good taste the Scottish poet compresses here, and also pawkily adds point to the passage about the false priests.

Stanza of K. Q.	"Kingis Quair": compare with	Stanza of C. of L.	"Court of Love."
90 to 93	The fourth group are the young people who were forced by their friends to enter the Cloister, or were married to those they did not love, or happily wed but bereft of their partner. *Note.*—The Scottish poet undoubtedly has many touches all his own. The young folks may very easily have been suggested by the aged folks: that group at any rate is not copied from the *Court of Love*. Then again, in the fourth group, the unhappily wed and the happily wed are original. But as regards (1) the first group, (2) the third group, and (3) the first half of the fourth group, they are direct imitations of the *Court of Love*.	159 163 164	For Venus wot, etc. Our friends wick in tendir youth, etc.
94 to 98	Reminiscent of Chaucer frequently.		
99 to 103	Compare "Hye Quene of Lufe," etc.	90 91 93	Where Philogenet bethinks him of his "orisoun." Fairest of alle, etc., to Be merciable with thy fire of grace.
104	The necessity for different handling of the theme is again noticeable here; but note that while at the end of stanza 93 of the *Court of Love* the description of Rosial begins, in the *Kingis Quair* the goddess is described.	93 94	Note the "crystal eyes" of the Goddess in the *Kingis Quair*, and also of Rosial in the *Court of Love*.
105 to 108	The construction of the poem is here necessarily quite different from the *Court of Love*.		
109 to 124	Many Chaucerian imitations. Compare with	151 147	Compare with Goodhope in the *Kingis Quair*. Goth on she said, etc.
133	Compare Minerva with	3	

STANZA OF K. Q.	"KINGIS QUAIR": compare with	STANZA OF C. OF L.	"COURT OF LOVE."
134	Compare Hypocrisy.	175	Avaunter.
139 to 142	Compare with	96 to 98	
143	Compare with	99	
151	"als straught as ony lyne."	113	"straight and even as line"; *vide* also 20, "straight of line."
166 to 172	Note the puzzling lines (the 6th and 7th) of stanza 170, and compare the rimes with stanza 187 of the *Court of Love*; also the subject-matter of stanza 168 (5th and 6th lines) with 5th and 6th lines of stanza 184 of the *Court of Love*. Note also the word "hailsing" in stanza 166, and the word "halse" in stanza 185 of the *Court of Love*.	24: 184 to 187	

Note.—It is scarcely necessary to point out that both poems are written in the seven-line stanza, known as the rime royal. The "bille" in the *Court of Love* consists of seven stanzas: in the *Kingis Quair* the "bille" is referred to as "thir versis sevin"=one stanza of seven lines. In the *Kingis Quair* the number seven seems to play a part, *e.g.* in stanza 197 we read,

"I recommend my buk in lines sevin";

while the poem—deducting stanza 197, which is the *Envoy*—is made up of $28 \times 7 = 196$ verses.

NOTE E.

THE WOOING OF JAMES I. AND LADY JOAN BEAUFORT.

The romantic story of the wooing of King James the First and the Lady Joan Beaufort can be traced, like the evolution of a butterfly, through four distinct stages. In germ it is found in the ascription of the *Kingis Quair* in the Bodleian MS. (c. 1488); the second, or caterpillar stage, is reached in the *Historia Majoris Britanniae* (1521), when we are told that the poem relates to the lady Joan, and was written by James "while immured in the castle where the maiden dwelt with her mother"; the third, or dormant stage, is the period of 262 years between John Major and William Tytler; the fourth begins in 1783 and comes up to our own day, during which time the story has been abroad in the sunshine—

"A wingèd butterfly,
In the wide air making its wandering flight."

Mr. William Tytler was the first writer after Major who gave to the *Kingis Quair* the importance of an historical document.[1] But disregarding Major's intimation that the poem was written in the Castle of Nottingham, the seat of the Beauforts—which one takes to be the meaning of the sixteenth century historian—Tytler boldly transferred the courtship to Windsor Castle, his sole authority for doing so being an entry in the *Foedera* informing us that James was detained there in the year 1413.[2] "Probably," he says, "it was at this period that on viewing the beautiful Jane in the garden under the castle of Windsor he first became enamoured of her."[3] To the editor of 1783 the poem yielded up its sense easily. Annotating stanzas 23 and 24, he fixed on "the Tower of Windsor" as the place of confinement, from which, on the auspicious day in the month of May, the prince, looking out from his window, beheld "the beautiful Jane walking below in the palace garden." In the *Governor's Guide to Windsor Castle*[4] the prison is now well localized, and the visitor to the most majestic of royal residences, "around which gather the memories of all ages of England's greatness," has it pointed out to him as one of the sights of the place. "Leaving the Keep garden on the left, we see facing us the first Tower of the Upper Ward—the Devil's Tower. Rising from a fourteenth century basement, where there is evidence of the presence of captives, it is most celebrated as the abode of James I. of Scotland during the whole period of his detention at Windsor. Taken in a time of peace, when on his way to pay a visit as a youth to France, he was kept at Windsor by Henry IV. and Henry V. for eighteen years, growing to manhood and learning here all manly exercises.[5] . . . Harshly treated he was not, yet as an exile, and debarred from filling his rightful throne, he justly considered himself wronged. His uncle, the Duke of Albany, held all power in Scotland, and was not specially anxious that his nephew should return. At last, through the exertions of Sir Duncan Campbell, Albany's son-in-law, and others of the nobles not so nearly related, and rather in despite of than with the favour of Albany, the immense ransom of £40,000 was raised and paid, and James was set free. . . .[6] At Windsor

---

[1] Bower, Boyes, Bellenden, Leslie, and Drummond refer to the marriage in quite general terms. Buchanan alone speaks of James as "being passionately enamoured of Joan, the most beautiful woman of her time," and I have already suggested that in all probability he was acquainted with the poem, and identified it as the one referred to by Major.

[2] Tytler wrongly cites the year when James was at Windsor as 1415 (Tytler, p. 71).

[3] Tytler, p. 80.

[4] By the Most Noble the Marquis of Lorne, K.T. (Cassell & Co., 1895, p. 86).

[5] This is quite original; no writer hitherto has gone so far as to say that James was in Windsor for eighteen years. At p. 30 we are told that James remained for "nearly twenty years" at Windsor!

[6] One would like to know what are the Noble Marquis's authorities for many of his state-

he must have dreamed of what he might accomplish if he was set free. It was from one of the windows of the tower that he first saw Lady Joan Beaufort walking in the moated garden at the foot of the mound of the Keep. . . . Until the eighteen years were past, and Joan Beaufort, King Henry's cousin, became his queen, he lived in that tower. Then he went to dree his weird in the North. . . ."[1] Recent historians have given credence to the pretty legend about the Windsor courtship, and until the present time no one has been heard to doubt it. Even a writer like Dr. Hill Burton, whose scepticism made him reject much in the course of telling his country's history,—speaking of the wedding "as the very match which policy would have dictated,"—gives to the poem, as Tytler did, the importance of an historical document. "It was," he goes on to say, "a destiny uncommon among kings, to fall in love with a fair damsel casually seen: to wed her, as the one whose descent marked her to the politicians as the proper queen to bring with him to his kingdom, and finally to tell the story of his love in sweet verse worthy of a true poet."[2]

If, however, the *Kingis Quair* be simply a poetical composition belonging to the latter half of the fifteenth century, it will, like any poem "feigned and endited, not for any truthe of the matter to be beleued, but for disporte and passetyme onely," be entitled to no consideration whatever from the historian.

Let us examine the entries in the public registers[3]—the best of all evidence—to ascertain if possible where James passed the eighteen years of his captivity.

August 14, 1406. To Richard Spice, lieutenant of Sir Thomas Rempston of the Tower of London, by the hands of William Darelle twice, and once by his own, for the expenses of the household of the King of Scotland and other prisoners in his keeping, 44l. 7s. 10d.—Issue Rolls (Pells) Easter, 7 Hen. IV. Bain's *Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland*, Vol. IV., 723.

March 8, 1406-7. James is still confined in the Tower.—*Ib.* 727, 739.

June 10, 1407. James is removed from the Tower, and goes to Nottingham Castle under charge of Richard, Lord de Grey. He resides there and at Evesham for three or four years (*Ib.* 739, 740, 769, 777, 781, 784; Wylie, *Hist. of England under Hen. IV.*, Vol. II., c. 61; Ord. Priv. Council, I, 304). The

---

ments. It is scarcely necessary to correct all the misstatements in a "popular" guide book, but, as regards "the Ransom of £40,000," it is not the fact that it was paid. Not more than 9000 marks was ever paid, and in consequence the majority of the hostages, or their substitutes, remained permanently in England (*vide* Bain's *Calendar*, Vol. IV., Pref. xxxii., and authorities cited). The prominence given to Sir Duncan Campbell is not warranted by the authorities.

[1] Several stanzas of the *Kingis Quair* are quoted.

[2] *Hist. of Scot.*, Vol. II., p. 397.

[3] I cannot be sure that I have gathered out of the registers all the entries about James: the list is, however, complete enough for the purpose of this note.

Close Roll, 12 Hen. IV. 18, shows that on March 21, 1411, Griffith ap Owen Glendourdy and Owen ap Griffith ap Richard, James's fellow-prisoners, were removed from Nottingham Castle back to the Tower of London.

May 14, 1412. James is at Southampton "on his way to testify his good will to the king."—Bain, IV. 822; *Nat. MSS. of England*, Part I. 36.

November 30, 1412. James is at Croydon, probably residing there in the palace of Archbishop Arundel. This entry depends on the authority of the Croydon charter purporting to be written and sealed by James.

March 21, 1412-3. Henry V. ascends the throne: his first order relates to James, who is conveyed to the Tower of London.—Bain, IV. 837.

July 17, 1413. James is still in the Tower.—*Ib.* 847.

August 3, 1413. By order of the king he is delivered to the Constable of Windsor Castle (*Ib.* 850, 852, 857; *Foedera*, IX. 40, 44, 48, 60). Thereafter he goes to Pevensey, near Eastbourne (*Scotichronicon*, XV. 18; Wylie, *ib.*); and thence back to Windsor (*Excerpt Hist.* 144; Wylie, *ib.*).

October 31, 1413. James is back in the Tower of London.—Bain, IV. 852.

February 1413-4. He is still in the Tower.—*Ib.* 852.

October 20, 1414. He is still there.—*Ib.* 857.

1415. In this year James petitions Henry V. that certain Scots may come to treat for his deliverance.—*Chancery Miscell. Portfolios*, No. 11, no date. Bain, IV. 872.

December 14, 1415. James is still in the Tower, under charge of Sir John Pelham, and is spoken of as having been there since "22 February last."—*Ib.* 874.

March 18, 1415-6. He is still there.—*Ib.* 874.

November 4, 1416. He is still there, and Sir William Bourchier receives a payment on his account as "from January last."

January 30, 1416-7. James addresses letters to friends in Scotland—among others to his brother-in-law, Archibald, fourth Earl of Douglas—urging that steps be taken towards his release. The letter to Douglas is one of four dated "the penultyma day of Januier," and is written from Stratford Awe. Drafts of these letters are preserved in the Register House, Edinburgh, evidently in the handwriting of his secretary or chaplain. The handwriting is different from the Croydon Charter, *supra*.

Sir William Fraser (*The Book of Menteith*, and *The Book of Douglas*) reads Stratford Awe as equivalent to Stratford-on-Avon, but there was no castle of importance there so far as I can find. I rather incline to the opinion of Mr. Wylie in regarding it as Stratford Abbey, near London, where Henry IV.

sometimes stayed during the closing years of his life (*Foed.* VIII. 694). Water Stratford, near Buckingham, has also been suggested (Wylie, *ib.*).[1]

May 24, 1418. James is conveyed from London to Kenilworth Castle.—Bain, IV. 886.

July 1, 1418. Sir John Rotheuale, Knt. Keeper of the Wardrobe, is paid £10 for the King of Scots.—*Ib.* 886.

May 13, 1419; November 30, 1419; March 7, 1419. James is still at Kenilworth.—Bain, IV., index *voce* Kenilworth.

May 9, 1420. James is at Southampton on his way to France (Bain, IV. 898). He takes part in the siege of Melun (*ib.* 898).

September 20, 1420. James returns from France.

April 1, 1421. He is at Leicester on Ascension Day (*Ib.* 908). The queen's coronation took place on February 14th at Leicester, and Henry called his Parliament to meet there on May 2. In this year negotiations begin for James's release.—*Foed.* X. 123, 125.[2]

December 4, 1421. James is in the Tower of London again.—Bain, IV. 911.

January 12, 1421-2. He is in Rouen.—*Ib.* 912.

February 18, 1421-2. He is still there.—*Rot. Scot.*, Vol. II. 231.

August 22, 1422. He is still in France. On August 31 Henry V. died, and James, "with a guard in close attendance on his person," accompanies the corpse to England.

October 1, 1422. A payment for James and his guard from 1st October, 1421, to 19th September, 1422, of £544 (Bain, IV. 918). On the same day Sir William Meryng, for attending on James at Rouen 210 days, gets £83 6s. 10d.

January 1422-3. James appears to have been at the Court of Westminster.—*Stevenson's Letters* (Rolls Series), Vol. I. 390.

February 17, 1422-3. Letters of safe conduct are granted to the Scots envoys to get access to the presence of James, then a prisoner in Pontefract.—*Rot. Scot.* II. 234.

February 22, 1422-3. James receives £20 for his expenses.—Bain, IV. 923.

May 12, 1423. James is still confined in Pontefract, and letters of safe

---

[1] There is little doubt that James was closely confined during 1417, as Henry V. was apprised of an attempt to rescue him and the Duke of Orleans, on the part of the Scots aided by French troops. The Duke, who was then at Pontefract Castle, was ordered "to be more closely confined." James, I think, was in London (*vide* Letter of Henry V., at the end of T. Livius; Speed, 637; *Foed.* IX. 568).

[2] Ambassadors had often come to England previous to this year, ostensibly to negotiate for James's release, but really for the purpose of negotiating the exchange of the Earl of Fife, son of the Regent Albany, for young Percy, son of the Earl of Northumberland (*vide* Rapin, Vol. IV. 280, 281). I have not deemed it necessary to note these embassies before 1421.

conduct are granted to envoys to obtain an interview with him in the castle (Salvus conductus pro Episcopo Glasguensi et aliis, cum rege Scotiae apud Pountfreit locuturis). James is designated "carissimus consanguineus noster Jacobus rex Scottorum," and the envoys are permitted to come "ad villam nostram de Pountfreit ad presentiam prefati consanguinei nostri."—*Rot. Scot.* II. 236; Bain, IV. 927, 931.

June 2, 1423. James receives £100 for his private expenses.—*Foed.* X. 290; Bain, IV. 931.

June 30, 1423. The English Treasury is authorized to defray James's expenses during his absence from the King's Palace, including attendants: referring to the approaching conference at York.—*Foed.* X. 293.

July, 1423. Arrangements are made for his travelling establishment.—*Foed.* X. 296; *Rot. Scot.* II. 234, 236.

July 6, 1423. The English envoys receive their Letter of Instructions regarding the terms on which James might be set free. The last head of the Instructions is as follows: Lastly, they (the English envoys) might suggest, if the Scots showed themselves inclined for a matrimonial alliance, that there were "many noble ladies, nay, even ladies of the royal lineage in England, with whom James was already well acquainted." But, the Instruction added, if the Scots should not mention marriage, it would not be desirable to use plainer language, "as English ladies are not wont, at their own instance, to offer themselves in marriage."—*Foed.* X. 295; Bain, IV. 929.

August 19, 1423. The Scottish Parliament nominates Commissioners to treat with the English for James's release.—Bain, IV. 932.

September 10, 1423. The terms of release are definitely arranged in the Chapter House of York: the Scots agreeing to pay £40,000 stg. in respect of James's expenses while in England, in six yearly instalments: they also approved of the matrimonial project, undertaking to send envoys to London in October to settle the terms of the contract.—*Foed.* X. 295; Bain, IV. 933; *Rot. Scot.* II. 239.

December 4, 1423. The Instrument of Release is drawn up, terms of payment of ransom adjusted, list of hostages tendered, and the drafts adjusted of obligations to be sealed by hostages, by James, and by the cities of Edinburgh, Perth, Aberdeen, and Dundee.—Bain, IV. 993.

January 20, 1423-4. James receives 200 marks for his wedding outfit, and a week later £24 stg. additional.—*Parl. Proceedings*, III. 131, 133.

February 13, 1423-4. James and Joan are married in the Church of St. Overy, Southwark. The date is inferred from the fact that on 13th February an acquittance for one instalment of the ransom was given to James by way of dowry for his bride. In the *Rot. Scotiae*, II. 246, a document recites the marriage as having taken place on 10th February, but a memo. in *Foedera*

states that the warrant to seal the deed was only issued on 13th February. Sir James Ramsay (*Lancaster and York*, Vol. I.) observes that 13th February was a Sunday, that day being a favourite one for weddings. The Bishop of Winchester officiated, and the newly-wedded pair had their wedding feast at his palace.—*Foed.* X. 322; *Rot. Scot.* II. 246; *Chron. Lond.* 112; R. Fabian, 593.

March, 1423-4. James and Joan set out for Durham.—*Ib.*

March 28, 1424. James is free *de facto*: hostages are delivered up and duly verified: bonds are sealed, and a truce for seven years from 1st May is concluded.—*Foed.* X. 324, 328, 335.

April 5, 1424. James ratifies the treaty regarding his release in terms of the condition which required that to be done across the Scottish Border, "Melros, 5th April, 1424."—Bain, IV. 955.

May 21, 1424. James is crowned at Scone.—*Rot. Scot.* II. 474.

On the evidence we may now proceed to consider these three points, namely: (1) James's residence at Windsor, (2) the conjectural dates assigned by Mr. William Tytler and Professor Skeat respectively for the composition of the *Kingis Quair*, and (3) the element of romance in the current story about the royal marriage.

§ 1. As to James having been detained a prisoner at Windsor. A cursory glance at the foregoing entries shows clearly that it does not accord with fact to say that James passed any considerable time at that royal residence. So far as the records show, he was there only once for a few weeks in the summer of 1413. The long periods during which he was imprisoned in the Tower of London, and the close guard maintained at all other times, will impress most readers.

§ 2. Mr. Tytler's suggestion that James probably first saw Joan in 1415 from his prison at Windsor Castle is disproved by the records. James in that year was a prisoner in the Tower of London. So also we may affirm with certainty that Professor Skeat's conjecture about the poem having been written at Windsor in May or June, 1423, is a pure figment. James, during the spring and summer of that year, was in close confinement within the royal castle of Pontefract, busying himself, as was natural, in arranging for the coming of the envoys who were to settle the terms on which he might regain his liberty.

§ 3. The element of romance in the accepted story of the royal marriage must disappear when we find that the *Kingis Quair* is not available to the historian, and also that there is not the slightest evidence to warrant Windsor Castle being selected as the place where the courtship took place.

It is observable that nowhere is there in any record a hint about the Lady Joan Beaufort being the fiancée of James until after 10th September, 1423, when the terms of his release were definitely arranged. From the Letter of Instruction, of date 6th July, 1423, it is plain that a matrimonial alliance was much desired on the part of the English. The proposal was no doubt, in the first instance, to come from the side of the Scots, but if it was made, then the English Commissioners were to mention that there were "many noble ladies, even ladies of the royal lineage, with whom James was already well acquainted." The tenor of that letter certainly leads one to infer that on 6th July James was heart-whole, and that until after 10th September he could not have been betrothed to Joan. There is besides a decidedly honest and straightforward ring in the concluding sentence of the letter, which seems quite to negative the idea of a preconcerted scheme on the part of the Regent and the royal family to bring about the marriage of Lady Joan, to the exclusion of any other noble or royal lady whom James might prefer. Whether the English Commissioners, without violating either the letter or the spirit of their instructions, hinted at the desirability of an alliance in the interests of both nations, or whether the proposal truly emanated in the first instance from the Scots, can only be conjecture now; but once the matrimonial project was approved, it is natural to suppose that the Beauforts would be very desirous that the alliance should be with a lady of their own family. James, we may believe, was already well acquainted with Joan;[1] and there may be but slight justification for suggesting a *mariage de convenance*;[2] all the same, when the facts are examined, we can see that there is no authority whatever for the rose-coloured story derived from the *Kingis Quair*, and told by so many modern historians on the faith of the editors of that poem. Future editors may better accept the Aristotelian canon, that it is the poet's function to relate, not what has happened, but what may happen; and that poetry is of higher worth than history.

---

[1] In "The Order of the Guests at the Coronation Banquet of Catherine of Valois, wife of Henry V., 24 February, 1421," printed in "A Booke of Precedence," E. E. T. Society edition (extra series), p. 89, we find "James Kyng off Scottes yn a State" placed "on the lyfte hond off the quene" and at "the secounde Borde of the ledys" is "My lady Ione Somersett."

[2] In the historical fragment entitled "*Ane Schort Memoriale of the Scottis Croniklis for addicioun*" (Maitland Club Publications), p. 7, Joan Beaufort's death, on 15th July, 1445, is noticed, the chronicler adding, "This quene forsaid was callit Jane and scho was the duke of somersydis douchter that King James the first spousit in yngland *for till help to louss him furth of it*." Regnault Girard's *Relation* goes to show that the marriage was a happy one, *vide* "Le Roman d'un Roi d'Ecosse," by M. Jusserand (Paris, Hachette et cie 1895).

No. V.

NOTES ON A PRECEPT OF INFEFTMENT

GRANTED BY QUEEN ANNE OF DENMARK, WIFE OF JAMES VI., AS LADY DUNFERMLINE: A.D. 1601.

BY

T. ETHERINGTON COOKE.

[*Read at a Meeting of the Society held on 19th March 1896.*]

THIS is a Precept, dated 20th December 1601, addressed to the Corporation of Dunfermline[1] by Anna, Queen of James VI., as "Lady Dunfermeling," requiring them to receive John Walker as tenant of certain heritable subjects situated within the Burgh. The Lordship of Dunfermline was presented to Anna, daughter of Frederick II. of Denmark, by King James, at his marriage; as a "morrowing gift," in accordance with an ancient custom prevalent in the North at that period. The Queen was duly infeft in the Lordship on the 17th May 1590[2]; and thereupon assumed the title of "Lady Dunfermline."

---

[1] Dunfermline was probably made a Royal Burgh by Alexander I., about the middle of his reign—say, *circa* A.D., 1115. It first appears in a charter as "burgum meum," in the year 1126. King James VI., on coming of age, granted a Charter of Confirmation to the Burgh, confirming the gifts and privileges bestowed on the Burgh by three of the Abbots, viz., by Robert in 1332, by John in 1395, and by George in 1549. By an Act of the thirteenth Parliament of James VI., the Temporalities of Dunfermline Abbey were annexed to the Crown. (*Vide* Murray's *Laws and Acts of Parliament*, Edinburgh, MDCLXXXI, page 329.)

[2] Moyse says, "Upon the 12th day of the month of May, Peter Monk, Admiral of Denmark, Stephen Bra, Braid Ransome, and Henry Goodlister, with some other Danes, rode towards Falkland, Dunfermline, and Linlithgow, to take seizin in the Queen's Majesty's name of these three lordships as her dowry." By Act 10 of the twenty-first Parliament of James VI., this gift was confirmed to the Queen "for all the dayes of hir Hienes' lyf-tyme." In the year 1612, there was confirmed an Infeftment conveying the Lordship of Dunfermline, not only to the Queen, but also to the heirs of the King's body. The Queen died in March

The Document, which was found in Stirling in November, 1892, by Fred H. Newbery of the School of Art, and is at present in his possession, sets forth that the late Laurence Wilson, a burgess of Dunfermline, having died without lawful heirs and without "agnet attingent" to him, his property had lapsed to the Queen, by right of her infeftment in the Lordship. This property consisted of certain annual-rents and a house[1] and tenement of land having a frontage to the High Street; and seems to have been held "burgage." The Queen, by this "Preceptum Infeodaceonum," presents John Walker, a merchant and burgess of the town, to the Provost and bailies, as a sufficient tenant for the property; and requires them to receive and duly recognize him as such. This person appears to have been the Dean of Guild whose name occurs in a Deed of Mortification of 2000 pounds Scots by Queen Anna, in favour of the Grammar and Music Schools of Dunfermline, dated 24th August 1610.[1] Among the Abbey Books is one entitled—"Registrum Cartarum Annæ Reginæ," which comprises the years 1600 to 1611; but the Precept we are describing does not appear in it; owing, perhaps, to the M.S. of that Register being imperfect near its commencement.

The Document is signed by both the King and the Queen:

James R.
Anna R.

1619. Shortly after her death, her son Prince Charles (afterwards Charles I.), was infeft, (19th June 1619), in those portions of his mother's lordship which had not been alienated. Charles I., by an Act of the Scottish Parliament (28th January 1633), revoked and annulled all infeftments, etc., made during his minority, which, dating from his birth in 1600 must have included this precept.

[1] In *The Annals of Dunfermline*, Glasgow, MDCCCLXXIX, page 306, under the date 1640, is the following extract from the Dunfermline Kirk Session Records—(Laurence Wilson's House burnt with all his plenishing, Collection made for him)—"James legat and thomas elder collected at the Kirk doore 9 lbs; James readdie and Jon bennet at the Kirk style 21 lbs; total 30 lbs, qlk was deliveret to ye said Jon Wilson for his present releefe." It would thus appear that in 1640, the subjects in question were again in the possession of a Wilson. The lapsing of Laurence Wilson's property to the Queen in 1601 and her disposition of it to John Walker, probably created some popular feeling in the little Burgh at the time; for the house continued to be known by the name of the deceased Burgess, until destroyed by

and in the opposite corner are the counter-signatures of Lords Fyvie and Blantyre, and of Sir Thomas Hamilton; three of the Commissioners of the Treasury. Alexander Seton, Lord Fyvie and Baron Urquhart (a branch of the Winton family), was the distinguished Lord President of the Court of Session; and in 1596, Queen Anna, with the consent of the King, appointed him Constable of the Palace of Dunfermline. He held the post of Chancellor of Scotland, was created Earl of Dunfermline 4th March 1605, and died 16th June 1622. Above his signature are the words—"Comp° fourtie shillings," showing that John Walker had duly paid that amount of "Composition," a fee payable on the entry of heirs or successors.

The signature "Blantyre" is that of Walter Stewart, Commendator of Blantyre; who was "bred up along with" James VI. under George Buchanan. He was nominated a Privy Councillor and Keeper of the Privy Seal, 14th November, 1582; and installed High Treasurer in 1596. Though not created a peer until 10th July, 1606, he had a charter as "Walter, Lorde Blantyre, oure Treasurer" dated 18th January 1598, which accounts for his here signing as a peer. He died 8th March 1617. The third signature is that of Sir Thomas Hamilton of Byres who was "K^t Secretar" at this date. A charter granted by "Lady Dunfermline" in 1603 to Henry Wardlaw, and now preserved at Pitfirrane House, is similarly signed and sealed.

The Seal and Counter-Seal.

These are in a fair state of preservation, and present several points of heraldric interest. The Seal shows the marital impalement of the arms of King James VI. of Scotland with those of Anna of Denmark; which may be blazoned as follows: *Or*, a lion ramp. within a tressure fleury counter fleury demidiated *gu.*, for **SCOTLAND**; impaling for **DENMARK**, —A Cross *arg.*, fimbriated *gu.* In the dexter canton, *Or*, semée of

---

fire 40 years afterwards. The unusual collection at the church doors seems to have partaken of the nature of a demonstration of opinion in favour of John Wilson's having become proprietor of the house after the Queen's precept was annulled by King Charles in 1633.

hearts ppr., three lions pass. guard. in pale *az.* armed *gu.* crowned of the first, for **DENMARK.** In the sinister canton, *gu.*, a lion ramp., imperially crowned, and holding in his paws a battle-axe *arg* for **NORWAY.** In the dexter base, *az.*, three crowns ppr., for **SWEDEN** and in the sinister base, *Or*, a lion pass. guard. *az.*, with nine hearts three three and one in chief and two in base *gu.*, for **JUTLAND.** In the base of the shield, below the Cross, *gu.* a wyvern, its tail nowed and wings expanded *Or*, the ancient ensign of the **VANDALS.** Upon the centre of the Cross an escutcheon of pretence, charged with Quarterly 1. *Or*, two lions pass. guard. *az.*, for **SLESWICK.** 2. *Gu.*, an inescutcheon having a nail in every point thereof in triangle, between as many holly leaves, all ppr., for **HOLSTEIN.** 3. *Gu.*, a swan *arg.*, beaked and membered *sa.*, ducally gorged, for **STORMERK**: and 4. *Az.*, a chevalier, armed at all points, brandishing a sword, his helm plumed, his charger *arg.*, barded *Or*, for **DITZMERS.** Surtout-de-tout, on an inescutcheon, *Az.*, a cross patée fitchée *Or*, for **DALMENHURST**, impaling for **OLDENBURGH**, *Or* two bars *gu.* Supporters,—Dexter, an Unicorn *arg.*, armed, ungulated and crined *Or*, gorged with a coronet composed of crosses patées and fleurs-de-lys *Or*, a chain affixed thereto of the last, passing between the fore-legs and reflexed over the back, for **SCOTLAND**; Sinister a Savage wreathed about the temples and loins *vert*, holding in his exterior hand a club erect ppr., for **DENMARK.** Above the shield, the Crown of James VI., below it, a part of the Collar of the Order of the Thistle. The inscription on the Seal is as follows:

SIGILLUM ANNÆ DEI GRATIA SOOTORUM REGINÆ.

The following are the points of heraldric interest in connection with this Seal. The arms of Anna of Denmark here differ slightly from those borne by her father King Frederick II. of Denmark, as blazoned on his Garter-Plate fixed at Windsor in 1581. In the latter quartered shield, the sinister base bears for **JUTLAND**, nine hearts five and four, and a lion pass. guard. in chief: and on the inescutcheon surtout-de-tout, the impalement of **OLDENBURGH** by **DALMENHURST** is reversed. In this Seal as also on the Garter-Plate of King Frederick, the Cross is straight and it is a Cross *arg.*, fimbriated *gu.*; and not a white cross charged upon

a red one; this is, accordingly, the Cross of the Danish Standard, with a red fimbriation to represent the red field of the National Flag itself. The Cross of the Order of the Dannebrog is now charged upon the Shield of Denmark: it is a Cross Patée *arg.*, with the red fimbriation carried round the ends of the Cross. The present Arms of Denmark show that other changes have taken place in them since the time of Frederick II., the quarterings of Iceland, the Faroe Islands, and of Greenland having been added to the Shield; and that of Lanenburg to the Escutcheon of pretence; while Sleswick has disappeared from this Escutcheon. Arms similar to those on the Seal are sculptured on a stone (now much weathered), built into the ruins of the Frater-House of the Abbey at Dunfermline. This stone was probably brought from "the Queen's House," as it was called, owing to its having been built for herself by Queen Anna of Denmark, 1597-1600; the house was entirely demolished in 1797. In this sculpture, the Sinister Supporter is a lion rampant; and it thus appears that the adoption by Denmark of Savages as Supporters took place about the middle of the year 1601. It may also be noted that, on the Seal, the Savage holds his club erect, whereas in the present arms of Denmark, those Supporters rest their clubs upon the ground. The Crown above the Shield has four crosses and four fleurs-de-lys; and contains no roses; the Union not having yet taken place.

The Counter-Seal is that of the Lordship of Dunfermline. The Shield armorial in the centre is the paternal coat of Queen Margaret, wife of Malcolm Canmore, who in later years was chosen as the Patron Saint of the Abbey. She was daughter of Edward the Confessor, who bore—*Az.*, a Cross *fleury* betwixt five martlets *Or*. These arms are shown on this Counter-Seal without any differencing or mark of cadency; in accordance with a law of Heraldry, the arms of the Queen having been adopted by the Abbey *subsequent* to her decease. The open Crown of four points fleury which surmounts the shield is that in use in the eleventh century, and is known as a "Margaret" Crown. On either side of the shield is a thistle surmounted of a Scottish Crown.

The inscription on this Counter-Seal is as follows:

SIGILLUM DOMINI DE DUMFERMLING.

THE PRECEPT.

Anna be the grace of God Quene of Scottis. To the provest and bailzies of our^{e} bur^{h} of Dunfermeling and als to Williame Walwood burges of oure said bur^{h} and Patrick Walwood of Gray atheris or ather of zow immedeat superiors of the hous and Anuelrentis re^{vne} eftir foirfeit and to alle and sindrie vther immedeat superior yairof q^{t}sumevir and of quhatsumevir vther Anuelrentis quhilkis pertenit or quhilkis may be knawin to have pertenit to vmq^{le} Laurence Wilsone burgess of Dunfermeling greiting. Witt ze me as Lady Dunfermeling have ane guid and vndoubtit richt to the Lordschyp thairof haill fruitis rentis proffeittis emolumentis casualiteis and dewtteis quhatsumevir pertening thairto Vnderstanding that all and haill ane Anuelrent of TEN PUNDIS vsuale money of this realme qu^{hlk} pertenit of befoir to the said vmq^{le} Laurence Wilsone his airis and assignayis heretablie To be taken vp zeirlie frie of alle burthenis that tenement of land perteining to the said Williame Walwood lyand within oure bur^{h} of Dunfermeling vpon the north syde of the hie streit yairof Being the tenement of land pertening to Maister George Crichtoun on the wast and the tenement of land pertening to George Turnble on the eist and the hie Calsae of oure said bur^{h} on the south and north pairtis Vnder reversioune of ane hundreth pundis S. And that the heretable richt and propertie of that hous contening ane chalmer and ane seller pertening to Thomas Crystisoun in pittencreif sumtyme occupeit be the said vmq^{le} Laurence lyand within o^{e} said bur^{h} hefing the tenement of land pertening to Williame Wricht on the eist and the tenement of land pertening to Johne Bennett on the wast and north pairtis and the hie street of o^{e} said bur^{h} on the south Vnder reversioune of ane vther hundreth pundis With ane vther Anuelrent of fiftie merkis qu^{hk} the said vmq^{le} Laurence had pertening to him heretablie fur^{t} of thea ... a teris of land pertening to the said Patrik Walwood lyand not fur distant fra o^{e} said bur^{h} TOGIDDER with all vther Anuelrentis qu^{hkis} pertenit to the said vmq^{le} Laurence vpliftit be him fur^{t} of quhatsumevir landis or tenementis within oure regalitie of Dunfermeling. We now becum and fallin in oure handis all restand to the said vmq^{le} Laurence

Be the richt of oure infeftment and the privelege yairof grantit to ws be oure Soveraine Lorde vpon the said Lordschyp of Dunfermeling Throv the said vmq^le^ Laurence deceissing this Lyf without onie bairnis lawfullie gotten of his bodie and without lawfull agnet attingent to him in blude of the fatheris syde Quha may succeid to him in the said Annuelrentis landis and heretais. And now being willing That the saidis provest and bailzies of o^e^ said bur^h^ of Dunfermeling Williame and Patrik Walwoodis or ather of yaim immedeat superior of the said hous and Anuelrentis rev^ne^ and all vtheris personis q^t^sumevir immedeat superior of quhatsumevir vther Anuelrentis qu^lkis^ pertenit or justlie micht have pertenit to the said vmq^le^ Laurence Bot on nawayis prejudeseit of thair superioritie yairof Bot rather provydit of ane sufficient tennent yairfor. With approbal consent assent and authoritie of the richt heich richt excellent and michtie prince JAMES the saxt be the saint grace of God King of Scottis our darrest Lorde and husband for his mai^ties^ interest and with speciall avys and counsall of o^e^ trustie and weilbelovit Counsellors undersubscrivand TO HAVE presentit Lyke as be thir pñts we pñt JOHNE WALKER merchand burges of oure said bur^h^ of Dunfermling his airis and assignayis immedeat heretable tennentis to the saidis provest and bailzies of Dunfermeling Williame and Patrik Walwoodis or ather of zow immedeat superior yairof and to all and sindrie vtheris the said vmq^le^ Laurence Wilsone his immedeat superior of q^t^sumevir vther Anuelrentis qu^hkis^ pertenit or qu^lkis^ micht have pertenit to him. Requiring zow and everie ane of zow to ressave the said JOHNE WALKER his airis and assignayis as immedeat tennentis to zow yairof According as the saim hous and Anuelrentis rev^ne^ ar haldin of zow and to delivir to yaim sufficient heretable resaseinentie of the saim To be haldin of zow and zour successors rev^ne^ siclyks and als frielie as the said vmq^le^ Laurence held the same befoir his deceis. Whom we with speciall consent assent authoritie counsall and advys foirsaidis have heirin grantit and disponit and be thir pñts geveis grantis and disponis to the said JOHNE WALKER and his foirsaidis airis richt and titill of q^t^sumevir airschyp guidis and geir qu^lkis^ pertenit to the said vmq^le^ Laurence Wilsone now pertening to ws and fallin and becum in oure handis as efeiris to ws be the privelege of o^e^ said infeftmentis. With power

to the saidis JOHNE WALKER and his foirsaidis To bruik and joye ȳ with vse and dispone ȳ vpone siclyk and als frielie als we or onie vtheris personnis in o^e name micht have done befoir the dait heirof CHAIRGEING heirfoir thir saidis provest and bailzies to entre the said Johne Walker and thair foirsaidis to the actuale reale and peceable possessioune of the saidis airschyp guidis and geir. And thir will be lawfull authoritie yairanent. **In witness** of thes infeftning Be thir pûts written be Johne Lie sygnete be Mr Johne Pary writer in Edinburgh subscryvit with o^e hande and handis of o^e said darrest Lorde and husband and trustie and weilbelovit counsellors under subscryvand and subscryvit. At Dunfermeling the twentie day of December the zeir of God 1^m sax hundreth and ane zeiris and of his mai^ties rayne the thrittie five zeir

JAMES R.
ANNA R.

Comp^o fourtie shillings
A SETON FYVIE
Recet Blantyre
THO^S HAMYLTOUN

No. VI.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON HISTORIES OF INVENTIONS AND BOOKS OF SECRETS.

(*SECOND SUPPLEMENT.*)

BY

JOHN FERGUSON, LL.D., F.S.A. Lond. & Scot.,
REGIUS PROFESSOR OF CHEMISTRY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

(*Read at a Meeting of the Society, held on 15th March, 1894.*)

1. The "Notes" which were communicated to the Society on March 15, 1894, formed a supplement embracing the histories and receipt books which I had examined during the previous six years. In printing them, however, it has been found necessary, in consequence of their bulk, to take them in sections. The first of these, called the First Supplement, was printed in the *Transactions* for 1895, Vol. II., p. 364. It contained a list of histories of inventions and of collections of receipts written in Italian or by Italians. I had intended to pursue this method of division by countries with the remaining examples, but trial has shown me that while an arrangement based on language or nationality may be valuable for some purposes, it is not suitable historically for giving one a survey of the general progress of the arts, and still less bibliographically, since it separates translations from the originals, and thus fails to afford a complete view of the distribution and importance of a book. Keeping the bibliographical as the more accurate method of description before me, I have reverted to my original plan of treatment. The authors, therefore, in this Second Supplement, follow in chronological order, so far as I can

ascertain it, and the editions of their books are taken together, irrespective of the language in which they were written, or into which they have been translated.

Histories of Inventions.

2. In the previous supplement I had to enumerate the histories of inventions which I had acquired. Since then I have seen only two or three items which could be ranged under this head.

3. The first is a copy of Polydore Vergil's three books, without place, date, and printer's name, but supposed to have been printed at Strasburg by Schurerius about 1509. It is a small 4to, with an ornamental border round the title, and it contains the poem of Sabellicus at the end. There are copies in the British Museum and Cambridge University libraries. This is probably the first edition of the book which appeared in Germany, and it is different from that of Schurerius dated 1509, quoted in the list given in the first supplement.

In the same list there was included Han's undated edition in 8vo of the German translation, which contains a number of woodcut illustrations. Before it, however, the same translation had appeared in small folio, printed by Heinrich Stayner at Augsburg—the first edition in 1537, the second in 1544. Both are rare; for, during all the time I have searched for these books, it is only quite recently that I have acquired a copy of the 1544 edition. These editions also are enriched with woodcuts, boldly executed, and important as depicting the costumes, weapons, implements, buildings, actions, and ideas of people three and a half centuries ago. The 1544 edition contains the eight books, and has 10 preliminary leaves, and clxxi of text. There is a copy of the first edition in the University library at Cambridge, and of the second in the British Museum. Both are mentioned by Beckmann as being in the Göttingen library.*

There is also a translation of the first three books into Dutch, which appeared at Amsterdam in three volumes in 16mo. Besides my own copy, the only one I have seen is in the University library at Ghent. It has no date, but it seems to have been issued late last century.

---

* *Beyträge zur Geschichte der Erfindungen*, Leipzig, 1792, III., pp. 574, 575.

4. In the second part of my "Notes" (p. 244) reference was made to the work in which Dutens endeavours to show anticipations by the ancients of modern inventions. It seems to have acquired a certain amount of reputation, for at long intervals editions of it appeared. Those originally quoted were the English of London, 1769, and the French of London, 1796—the latter entitled the third edition. I have now got a copy of the so-called fourth edition, in French, published at Paris in 1812, in two 8vo volumes, containing respectively: I., pp. [4] 281; II. [4] 420. Whether the numbering of these editions is consecutive or not, I am unable to say.

5. The only other work belonging to this section of the subject I have come across, is a little volume prepared for the instruction of youth, entitled *Petit Dictionnaire des Inventions.* The third edition was published at Paris in 1825, and contains pp. [2] 11–286, with a symbolical frontispiece. The author gives a succinct account of ancient and modern discoveries in a manner as likely as possible to attract the readers for whom the book was prepared. It may be viewed as a modern counterpart to the *Pleasant and Compendious History of Inventions*, which was published at London in 1686, and was an alphabetical abstract of Polydore Vergil. From what is said on p. 284, this summary was written in the year 1812, and it is possible that this is not really a new edition, but a portion of the first issue with a new title page. The fact that pp. 1–10 are wanting seems to point to the cancelling of some preliminary matter which may have been thought not appropriate to the new title page. The book is interesting now as indicating what was considered worth knowing about discoveries and inventions at the beginning of the present century.

Books of Secrets.

6. The books which have come together for consideration on this occasion, refer as it happens, with one or two exceptions only, to medical secrets. They are all prior to 1600, at all events in composition, and for the most part in publication.

7. Under the name of Aristotle there has passed current for centuries

a treatise on the secrets of generation. So far as I am aware, it does not correspond to any of his original works, though it may be a later compendium from some of them. It is not to be confounded with the *Secret of Secrets*, another work ascribed to him, to which I shall refer presently. That upon generation was in great vogue, and cheap editions, accompanied by other tracts of similar tenor, used to be abundant, and are possibly still to be had. The treatise, however, is accounted spurious, and it is put among the pseudonymous Aristotelian works in the British Museum catalogue; but the authorship is a question of secondary importance at the present moment; it is sufficient that the book exists. The edition I have is not common, and it may, therefore, be described with some minuteness.

Aristotle's | Manual | of Choice | Secrets, | Showing | the Whole Myſtery of | Generation. | With | Receipts to prevent | Barrenness, | and Cauſe | Conception. | Very Neceſſary to be Known | and Practiced by all *Midwives*, | *Nurſes*, & *Young Married Women*. | Tranſlated out of *Latin* by *J. P.* | *London*, Printed for *John* | *Back*, at the *Black-Boy* on | *London-Bridge*, 1699. |

It is a small narrow 24mo, signatures A to F in twelves, misnumbered pp. 135 for 143, and 1 blank. This is a volume of varied interest: it is a London Bridge book; it seems to be the first edition, but this I should not like to affirm too strongly; it has a frontispiece of a birth, in which the attendant gossips are all—like so many hospital nurses—attired in a sort of uniform, with queer head-dresses; I cannot find it in the British Museum catalogue, although there are other editions there which resemble it; and I conclude that it is rare. The contents of this tiny manual—all things considered—are sober and sensible; though, of course, in some matters the author could not deliver himself from certain misconceptions of his time. As for the Latin original, I have not seen it, and I have failed to identify J. P. the translator.

Lowndes takes no notice of the book at all, but one finds instead this note: "Many other works have been published to which the name of Aristotle has been falsely affixed, but they are of no value or estimation." The comment upon which is that one wants descriptions of the books, not opinions as to their demerits; "I do not desire you to please

me; I do desire you to sing!" If would-be bibliographers acted on the principle of mentioning only books of merit, what need would there be for bibliographies at all?

8. The other work ascribed to Aristotle—a letter on the regulation of life, addressed to Alexander the Great—was mentioned in Part IV., p. 325, in connection with the English abstract of 1702. I have now got a copy of the complete work. The title is as follows:

SECRE
TA SE-
CRETO-
RVM.
ARISTO
TELIS:
Cum priuilegio.

It is a small square 8vo; A to O in eights (P dropped?), Q in 2; folios numbered i-cxiii, the last leaf not being numbered. Black letter, 31 lines to the page. On the *verso* of the last leaf is the colophon:

Explicit ſeptiſegmentatum opus ab Alexandro Achillino ambas ordinarias & philoſophie & medi cine theorice publice docente: vt non amplius in te- nebris latitaret editus Et impreſſus Pariſiis An no domino. 1520.

The title page has a quaint appearance. The title, arranged irregularly in large Roman capitals, is in red, and is enclosed in a border of separate pieces in black. The words *Cum priuilegio*, in gothic letter, are also in black.

No copy of this book is mentioned by Panzer, Brunet, or other bibliographer. It is a coincidence that, of the various editions of the book before and after 1501, it should be that of 1520 which has come to be described now, after the lapse of eleven years from my former notice of the work. For it was this very edition of 1520 which the editor of the abstract of 1702 says was so rare, that "it was not to be bought or seen (as far as he could find) anywhere but in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, and with one Gentleman in London."* In the British Museum there is a copy of the

* See Part IV., p. 326.

1520 edition (520.a.12), but I have not as yet examined it. Can it be the copy which belonged to the "Gentleman" just named?

In the Bodleian catalogue there is no copy of 1520, but I find instead the following entries under Aristoteles:

De secretis secretorum ex Arab. MS. in Lat. per Philippum quondam clericum. 4° s. l. et a.*

... acc. de signis tempestatum, ventorum et aquarum et de mineralibus, Lat. ed. Alex. Achillino. fol. Bon. imp. Bened. Hectoris. 1516.

I have not seen either of these books, and am unable therefore to speak with certainty; but I cannot help thinking that the former, *De secretis secretorum*, is identical with the first section (or part of it) of the 1520 edition, entitled "Secretum Secretorum," and that the latter corresponds with the section immediately succeeding that in the 1520 edition: "Maximi phylofophi Aristotelis de ſignis Aquarum: ventorum: & tempeſtatum," and "Aristotelis de mineralibus." I infer, therefore, that these two editions were practically reprinted in 1520. The later edition contains besides: "Alexander (*sic*) Aphrodiſei de intellectu"; "Averrois de beatitudine anime"; "Alexandri Achillini Bonienſis de Univerſalibus"; and "Alexandri Macedonis ad Ariſtotelem de mirabilibus Indie."

The treatise "Secretum Secretorum" has been known for the last eight or nine hundred years. It seems to have been originally an Arabic compilation which was made from the Greek, amongst other sources, and was turned by clerk Philip, whoever he was, into Latin. The part relating to physiognomy formed the groundwork of the tract on the same topic, which was edited by Michael Scotus, so that what there is to say about it had better be reserved for my bibliography of the works of that writer.

The English version of 1702 includes only a part of the treatise as it appeared in 1520, and of what is given portions are condensed, so that the editor quite correctly announces that it is "contracted." From what he further says, the version published in 1528 was also shortened, but I am not in a position to confirm the statement. The work, however, as I said formerly, falls within the scope of these notes rather on account of its name than of its contents.

* This seems to be Hain's No. *1779.

9. Of the famous works ascribed to Albertus Magnus, *De Secretis mulierum* and *De Secretis naturæ* or *Liber aggregationis*, several copies have recently come into my hands. Notwithstanding the multitude of editions through which they passed, copies are not common. As for those printed previous to 1501, they seldom appear in catalogues at all.

The earliest example which I have met with lately has no date or place, but was printed at Paris in the early years of the sixteenth century. The device on the title page is that of André Bocard,* who began to print at Paris a few years prior to the sixteenth century. The present work, I have no doubt, is subsequent to 1501. It is not in Hain, and I have failed to identify it with any of the editions in the Museum catalogue, or in Brunet or Graesse.

Secreta mulierũ et virorum | ab Alberto magno compoſita. | [Device.]
No place, date, or printer.
Small 4to. Signatures: a8, b and c in six, d8. No pagination. 42 lines. Black letter.
Collation: [ai] *recto*: Title page. The device consists of two tree trunks, with flowers. On the dexter trunk is suspended a shield with the arms of the University of Paris; on the sinister trunk a shield with the arms of the city of Paris; above all are two angels carrying a shield with three fleurs-de-lys, the arms of France, and above the shield is a crown. Round the device are the words: HONNEVR · AV · ROY · ET ⁘ ALACOVRT ◇ SALVT · ALVNIVERSITE ◇ DONT · NRE · BIEN · PROCEDE · ET · SOVRT ⁘ DIEV · GART · DE · PARIS · LA · CYTE. ⁘: The *verso* is blank.
aij *recto*: ſ Cribit philoſophus phorum priceps quarto ethico⁊ | Homo eſt optimũ eo⁊ que ſunt in mũdo. Et mũdus | etc.
Ends dviij *verso*: Ca. duodecimum *e* vltimum de gnatione ſpermatis in viro. |

Since the preceding was written, I have acquired another Paris edition:

Secreta mulierum | Et virorum nuperrime corre- | pta et emendata. 58 | [Device.]
Uenundãtur Pariſiis ab Joan | ne Paruo cõmorãte I vico ſancti | Jacobi ſub ſigno Lilii aurei. |

Small square 8vo; a to e in eights, f in four. In small black letter, 33 lines to the page. The device on the title page is Petit's initials on a shield,

* Louis-Catherine Silvestre, *Marques Typographiques*, Paris, 1853, No. 5. He says Bocard printed from 1496 to 1531, but according to the following authority a book seems to have been printed by him in 1494; *Gravures sur bois tirées des Livres Français du XVe Siècle*, Paris, Adolphe Labitte, 1868. 4to. Bocard's device is Fig. 324, and is on the title page of this volume; a suitable vignette for a Paris book.

suspended on a tree, with cupids and birds in the branches, the shield supported by a lion and a leopard.*

An edition of the parallel work of Michael Scotus was also published by Jean Petit, but the two are not quite uniform.

An edition similar to Bocard's, undated, but printed early in the sixteenth century at Paris, I found recently (April, 1896) in the Mazarine Library. I made the following note upon it:

Secreta mulierũ | et virorum ab alberto magno compſita (*sic*).

[Device. In a double border of flowers and grotesque figures is a tree with a shield: 3 roses above a crescent supported by two winged stags rampant, with crowns round their necks (gorged). Tied to the trunk of the tree by a ribbon are the initials, R.G., and below all: ROBERT GOVRMONT.]†

4to or large 8vo, a to d in sixes. Small black letter, double columns.

ai Title.

aii *recto*: Scribit philoſophus philo | ſophorũ princeps quarto | ethicorũ. ... the text ends dvi *recto*: on the *verso* Gourmont's device is repeated.

The copy which I got at Klemm's sale in 1889, at first sight seemed to be merely a duplicate of that in the British Museum, described in my *Notes*, Part III., p. 210. More minute examination, however, and direct comparison of the two copies, showed that though both were printed in uniform style at Antwerp in 1538, by the same person, they are different throughout. As the present is another case of two different issues with the same date, it may be worth while to indicate some of the variations by which one issue can be discriminated from the other. The following will suffice, though similar instances will be found on every other page.

The transcript of the title page of the British Museum copy already given, suits the present one except in the following minute points:

	Museum copy.	Present copy.
Title, l. 10:	| philoſophiæ, quàm Me- |	| philoſophiæ quàm Me- |
— l. 15:	olfaciẽs.	olfaciens.
—	In the shield in the centre of the printer's ornament there is a cross.	The shield is blank.

* Silvestre, *Marques Typographiques*, Paris, 1853, No. 25. Petit printed between 1493 and 1541. The present volume belongs to the early years of the sixteenth century.

† Gourmont's device is given by Silvestre, *Ibid.*, No. 81. He printed between 1498 and 1518.

The following are other differences:

Museum copy.	Present copy.
Title leaf or Ai *verso*:	
Prohemivm. | Scribit Philoſophus	Prohemivm. | Scribit Philoſophus
Philoſophorum prin- |	philoſophorū princeps: |
Ai *verso*, last line ends:	
Genimi (*sic*), Leo. |	Gemini, Leo. Illis correſpon- |
Aii *recto*, last line:	Last lines:
medicinalis. |	partim medi- | cinalis.
Aii *verso*. The small print of the note runs on continuously.	Divided into two paragraphs at l. 23, beginning: *Sapientia eſt cognitio*, etc.
Aiij *recto*, last lines:	
... appetitu intellectua- | li, quia vidit	... appetitu intellectuali, quia vidit |
vtilitatem cognitionis earum. |	vtilitatem cognitionis earum. |
Aiij *verso*, line 1: Secundo	ſecundo
last line: ...Vnde natu | ra |	... Vnde nam | nihil |
Diiij *recto*, l. 1. V is an ornamented capital.	plain.
Fviij *recto*, l. 3. A is ornamented.	plain.

In the Museum copy the numbers ij, iij, iiij in the signatures are written separate, in my own copy ij, etc., are written together. Contractions occur in the Museum copy which are wanting in mine, and *vice versa*. In the fourth line of the colophon (Gvij *verso*) the misspelling *recongnitis* as it stands in the Museum copy is correctly given *recognitis* in the other. The two issues differ typographically throughout, and the whole book must have been set up twice. It is difficult to believe that this happened in one year, and the fact that both issues have precisely the same date, seems rather to indicate that one is a reprint of the other, including the date, so that there may have been an interval of time between them. It could not have been long, however, for they have certainly issued from the same office. If this supposition be correct, I should think that the Museum copy belonged to the earlier edition, and that the other, in which the errata *Genimi* and *recongnitis* are wanting, was the later. Anyhow it is an event in the history of the book that there were two similar issues of the same year, just as happened in the editions of Lyons, 1566, as described in Part III., p. 210.

Another copy was acquired by me subsequent to this supplement being

read to the Society. It is dated Lyons, 1584, and is a small square 16mo, pp. 381, [11]. It contains also the analogous tract of Michael Scotus, and appears to be the second edition in this form. There was another at Lyons in 1580, but I have not seen it. This is one of the early examples of the pocket editions of Albertus, of which so many appeared in the following century.

Corresponding to this, and undoubtedly one of the least known of all these books is the French version of Michael Scotus' *Physiouomia*, made by Nicole Volkyr de Serouille, and published at Paris in 1540, in a small square 16mo. This is a book to which there is no reference by Brunet, and of which I have never seen any copy but one. It is not in the British Museum. An account of it, however, belongs properly to the bibliography of the wizard, and must be omitted here.

The following German version I found in the British Museum (07581. df. 19):

> Albertus Magnus | Von haimlichait der frawen · | Auch ist dauon schreijben Arestoteles · Galienus · Boe | cius · Constantinus · Ypocras · Auicenna &c. Als dann | hernach volget jnn disem büchlein. Du vinndest auch | mancherlaij frag menschlicher vñ thierlicher natur. | [Vignette.]
>
> Small 4to. a, b, in eights, c in six, no foliation. Black letter.
>
> The vignette is an elderly man, presumably Albertus, expounding secrets to a woman.
>
> cvj *recto* has this colophon:
>
> ¶ Hije ennden sich mancherlaij fragen mennschlicher | vnd thierlicher natur vnnd geschicklichait. Als die na | türlichen maijster dauon schreijben sind. Als Albertus | magnus · Arestoteles · Boecius · Cõstantinus · Egidius | Galienus · Auicenna · vnnd Ypocras &c · Anno &c · jm | zehenden jare. |
>
> *verso* is blank.
>
> The B. M. catalogue assigns the date 1510 to the book.

This is not a translation of Albertus' book, but is a collection from the authorities mentioned. The subject is discussed in catechism form: "Why?" is this, that, or the other thing—and the answer is: Aristotle, or Albertus, or Galienus says so and so. It is therefore a popular summary of physiological teaching, specially interesting to women. It contains, of course, a number of curious notions, but valuable as illustrating the beliefs of the sixteenth century.

10. Next come the copies of the *Liber Aggregationis* as it is called, of

which quite as many editions appeared separately and conjointly as of the other. It deals with the Secrets of Plants, Stones, and Animals, and in some of the editions there is included another tract on the Wonders of the World. Several editions in Latin have been described in previous parts of these "Notes," those which are now to be mentioned are translations into German and English.

Drei Bü- | cher Alberti Mag- | ni, Von wunder natürlichen | wirckungenn der Kreutter, | Edelgesteyn vnnd Thier, | mit leblicher Conter- | feytung derselbigen. | ∴ | 1536.

Small 4to. Signatures A to E in fours (E four is blank) or, ff. [1–2] 3–19. The title is enclosed in an elaborate border, and there are illustrations through the text.

Eiij *verso:* ℭ Gedruckt zu Franckfurt am Meyn | Bei Christian Egenolph. | 1536. Eiiij is blank.

At the top of the title in a compartment is a battle of nude warriors. At one side of the title are the three Graces; at the other a female holding a child on her right arm and a flaming heart in her left hand, with another child at her feet. In a large compartment at the bottom is represented a walled place with trees and a fountain. In it are nine female figures, some nude, others draped, and a male figure with a laurel wreath. The females are occupied in different ways, and the whole may be meant for Apollo and the Muses. On the *verso* is a woodcut to illustrate Exod. 17. The woodcuts of the plants are lifelike and spirited if rough, and those of beasts and birds are humorous. The text in this edition is curtailed as much as possible, every word and phrase that could be dispensed with having been omitted. It contains only the briefest account of plants, minerals, and animals.

Albertus Magnus. | Das Bůch der haymligkayten Magni | Alberti, von Artzney vñ tugendē der Kreüt- | ter, Edel geftayn, vnd von etlichen wol- | bekañten Thieren. | [large woodcut.] M.D.XXXX.

Small 4to. Signatures A to K in fours, no leaf or page numbers.

Kiij *verso.* Gedruckt zů Augspurg durch Haynrich Stainer.

Kiiij *recto* a woodcut.

Two-thirds of the title page are filled by a woodcut of a man in a study, sitting at a desk writing. It gives one an excellent idea of the furniture of such a place in the middle of the sixteenth century. The

16mo. Signatures A to H in eights. No pagination. Roman letter. The title is in a narrow border. No date, but about the end of the 17th or beginning of the 18th century. A chap-book.

A1 *r.* The title. *verso:* to the Reader.

A2. Blank.

A3 *r.* Text of the Secrets begins, and ends E1 *r.*

E1 *v.* The order of the Planets, ends E8 *v.*

F1 *r.* Book of the Marvels of the World, ends H8 *r.* The *verso* is blank.

Passenger in 1691* published *The Complete Servant Maid.* He was then on London Bridge. This book is of about the same date.

11. Since 1883, when I considered certain copies, both in print and in manuscript, of Bartholomew Glanville's work *De proprietatibus rerum*, and 1884, when I commented on the charge of plagiarism which had been brought against him, and showed a 15th century MS. of the same work, I have met with one or two items which had not been already alluded to. Besides these, however, I am able to include another and very fine copy of the Strasburg 1485 Latin edition, credited to Wynken de Worde, and a copy of Berthelet's English edition, 1535. The latter, which is in the Hunterian Library, I had already described, but could not exhibit. The present copy can be exhibited, without the necessity of describing it. A good deal of what seems to me now rather misplaced laudation has been expended on this volume. Lowndes says it is probably the finest specimen of Berthelet's printing. I have too limited a knowledge of his printing to either challenge or confirm that statement, but I have seen certain small tracts which to me are more attractive, both from the type used and the appearance of the page. In Glanville's book the letters seem commonplace, and the page is loaded and heavy for its size; and while it is undoubtedly a respectable solid folio, I could not say that it is a "magnificent book." It is certainly not to be compared with the 1480 edition in Latin. Still, if it be not absolutely beautiful, it is sufficiently rare, and it is sufficiently in demand on account of its contents and the English in which they are couched, to make it a prize when it does occur.

One of the novelties which I have to bring before you is the reprint that appeared fifty years later, edited by Stephen Batman. This is

an important book for several reasons, and a description of it may be given.

Batman | vppon Bartholome, | His Booke | *De Proprietatibus Rerum*, | Newly corrected, enlarged and amended: | with ſuch Additions as are requi- | ſite, vnto euery ſeuerall | Booke: | Taken foorth of the moſt approued Authors, the like here- | tofore not tranſlated in Engliſh. | *Profitable for all Eſtates, as well for the benefite of* | *the Mind as the Bodie.* | 1582. | London | Imprinted by Thomas Eaſt, dwel- | *ling by Paules wharfe.* |

Small folio. Signatures: 2 leaves; ¶, ¶¶, B to Z, Aa to Zz, Aaa to Zzz, Aaaa to Cccc in sixes; or, 14 leaves not numbered and 426 numbered. Black letter. Double columns of 53 lines each.

Collation: Title, surrounded by a broad border of scrolls. *Verso*, arms of Batman (?) with an interpretation of them in 14 lines of verse.

Leaf 2, *recto*. Batman's dedication to Lord Henry Cary.

— *verso*. Batman to the Reader.

¶ 1 *recto*, the Prologue of the Translator. *verso*, a collection of the Authors. Ends ¶ 6 *recto*, the *verso* of which is blank.

¶¶ 1 *recto*. Generall Table of the chapters, ends ¶¶ vj *verso*.

Bi *recto*. The Text begins, and ends Cccc vj *verso*. At the end of the Text is the printer's coat of arms, with the crest of the black horse having a crescent argent on its left shoulder, with the motto

MIEVLX · VAVLT · MOVRIR · EN · VERTV · |QVE · VIVRE · EN · HONCTE.

¶ Imprinted at London by Thomas East.

Part, at least, of the value of this book depends on its being not a mere reprint of Glanville's encyclopedia, but a veritable new edition; for Batman has made considerable "Additions," which are always distinguished from the original by that word as a heading or on the margin, and he has been at very considerable pains to make the book as useful as possible. The table of authors is an addition of his, and it is not a mere list, but it gives biographical notices of various writers quoted throughout the work. These are necessarily brief, but they are both useful and curious, even for their inaccuracies, as when Cornelius Agrippa is called a "Spaniard of excellent learning." As Batman was therefore fully alive to the advance of the times, and did his best to accompany it, his revision is a necessary adjunct to the two earlier editions of the English translation.

Batman's own account "To the Reader" of the occasion of his editing the work, is quite worth quoting in full:

country of Foix and Béarn, Isabella, his mother, was countess and mistress.* "Carolus Albricus," "the most faithful king of France," was then reigning, "with wars and troubles which increased mightily throughout the whole kingdom."† The English were fighting in Normandy, and took possession of Rouen. These dates and events certainly coincide with the time at which Valescus was busy with his book. They were examined also by Astruc,‡ who viewed them as confirmatory of Valescus' accuracy as a contemporary chronicler.

Ranchin calls him a Portuguese, and says that during the "vacances" he visited his native country every year. Subsequent writers repeat this statement.

The date of his settling in Montpellier is not quite fixed; it may have been about 1380, but from the above remark in his prologue, he must have begun the practice of medicine in 1382. He pursued this profession "with marked success and distinction," and ultimately became one of the most distinguished ornaments of the medical school at Montpellier. Castellanus says he was chief physician to the king of France.

The earliest summary of his life I have met with is by the said Petrus Castellanus,§ which is worth quoting:

> Valescus de Taranta, Monspelii, circa ann. Domini CIↃCCCLXXXII. Medicinam laude magnâ, & multorum fructu insigni facere cœpit. In quo genere studij cùm triginta sex annos continuasset, quæcunque & lectione, & quotidianis experimentis didicerat, in unum volumen congessit, quod *Philonij* nomine circumfertur. Tradunt etiam Archiatrum fuisse Regis Gallorum.

---

* See Ersch u. Gruber, *Encyclopädie*, XLVI., p. 119.

† Charles VI., *bien-aimé*, the well-beloved. I have not traced the name "Albricus." He had certainly numerous wars on his hands. Agincourt was fought in 1415. Rouen capitulated in January, 1419.

‡ *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de la Faculté de Médecine de Montpellier*, Paris, 1767, 4°. See pp. 208-211, where an account of our author is given.

§ *Vitæ Illustrium Medicorum qui toto orbe, ad hæc usque tempora floruerunt.* Antverpiæ, 1618, p. 166. Castellanus, Pierre Duchâtel, was an antiquary and physician, and became professor of Greek at Louvain. This volume contains 180 brief biographies, alphabetically arranged, a list of which is given by Mercklin (*Lindenius Renovatus*, Norimb., 1686, p. 883). The reprint by Gronovius, *Thesaurus Græcarum Antiquitatum*, Lugd. Bat., 1701, X., col. 853, contains only the biographies of Greek physicians, and should not have been put forward as Castellanus' complete work. *See* Stolle, *Anleitung zur Historie der Medicinischen Gelahrheit*, Jena, 1731, p. 243.

Mercklin,* to the preceding, which he has simply copied, has prefixed the statement: "Natus est Monspelii circa A.C. 1382," and subjoined another: "obiit circa A.C. 1418, ætatis suæ 36," without apparently having observed the irreconcilability of the statements. Mangetus,† who quotes the passage from Mercklin in full, directs attention to the discrepancy, but makes no attempt to remove what is obviously a muddle on Mercklin's part. Freher ‡ takes his account from Castellanus and not from Mercklin, but he commits the same error of placing his death in 1418. He adds, however, from Caspar Schott,§ the wonderful story of the rejuvenescence of a prioress, which Valescus || uses as an illustration of that subject. Kestner ¶ gets round the difficulty by giving no dates at all, but he is misled by Mercklin into saying that he was a native of Montpellier. He corrects, however, one or two mistakes of other writers. Portal,** following Ranchin, calls him a Portuguese, and gives a favourable notice of his book.

Eloy †† calls him a native of Montpellier, and repeats that he became physician of Charles VI. "about 1400." This is a new date added on to the older accounts. He says he made some excellent observations, which were still founded on in Eloy's time. He adds that Valescus did not understand Greek, and wrote shocking bad Latin. In the later edition ‡‡ there is an entirely new and in every respect a more satisfactory account,

---

* *Lindenius Renovatus*, Norimb. 1686, p. 1036.

† *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medicorum*, Geneva, 1731, II. ii., p. 355.

‡ *Theatrum*, Norimb. 1688, p. 1211.

§ *Physica Curiosa, sive mirabilia Naturæ et Artis*, Edit. altera, Herbipoli, 1667, p. 419. Schott calls him Valesius Tarentasius.

|| *Philonium*, Lib. VI., cap. 12. Rembert Dodoens, or Dodonæus, at the close of a small volume, *Medicinalium Observationum exempla rara*, Coloniæ, 1581, pp. 289-293, Hardervici, 1621, pp. 205-208, quotes a few striking cases from the *De Curandis Morbis* of "Valescus Tharantanus." Of course the prioress figures as one of them, p. 291, or p. 207. The story is told also by De Longeville Harcourt, *Histoire des Personnes qui ont vecu plusieurs siècles . . .*, Paris, 1715, p. 268.

¶ *Medicinisches Gelehrten-Lexicon*, Jena, 1740, p. 834.

** *Histoire de l'Anatomie*, Paris, 1770, I., p. 237.

†† *Dictionnaire Historique de la Médecine*, Liège, 1755, II., p. 431.

‡‡ *Dictionnaire Historique de la Médecine*, Mons, 1778, IV., pp. 458-9. Still there are slips; for instance: "Il se donne lui-même le nom François de Balescon de Tharare, dans la préface," etc. (p. 458).

which Dezeimeris has done little but copy and condense. Following Astruc Eloy praises the *Philonium* for its matter, but condemns it for its barbarous style. He does not know upon what authority Castellanus calls him the chief physician of the king, for his name is not found in the best lists of these physicians.*

Another writer who criticises his style is Albrecht v. Haller,† and he calls him "verbosus auctor," but credits him with discussing the opinions of others and expressing his own views. He gives a long but not very clear list of the editions of the *Philonium.*

Writers on the history of medicine during the present century have just repeated the older accounts. Dezeimeris' article,‡ for instance, is practically taken from Eloy, as I have just said. It is accurate, and as full as is possible within the limits of the book; it gives a list of editions and references to the authorities, though the latter are not sufficient, seeing that Eloy is omitted.

Upon this in turn is based the article by Gurlt,§ who has not attempted to add anything new.

A short notice of him was given by A. W. E. Th. Henschel,‖ in 1852, but this writer has not included a few quite legitimate facts, such as the

---

* While on this matter, it may be remarked that Dezeimeris says Tiraqueau, as well as Castellanus, Ranchin and Conring, gives him this title. He does not mention the passage, and it is possible, therefore, that I have overlooked it; but in one place Tiraqueau certainly does not give him the title: "Valescus Tarentinus, quem de Tarento vulgò appellant, cuius est Practica quam Philonium nuncupant, et alia quædam opera." *See* André Tiraqueau (Andreas Tiraquellus) *Commentarii de Nobilitate*, Lugduni, 1617, fol., p. 291, in the section in which he discusses whether the practice of medicine detracts from nobility. He gives a long alphabetical catalogue of physicians, in which the above appears.

† *Bibliotheca Medicinæ Practicæ*, Bernæ, 1776, Tom. I., pp. 454-5.

‡ *Dictionnaire Historique de la Médecine Ancienne et Moderne* . . . par MM. Dezeimeris, Ollivier (d'Angers) et Raige-Delorme, Paris, 1828-39, T. I., pp. 259-60. The author is called Balescon de Tarente, or de Tharare, in this work.

§ August Hirsch, *Biographisches Lexikon der hervorragenden Aerzte aller Zeiten und Völker*, Wien und Leipzig, 1884, I., p. 269.

‖ In his "Biographisch-litterarische Notizen, berühmte Wundärzte und Aerzte des XIII. und XIV. Jahrhunderts betreffend," article 34; published in *Janus, Central-Magazin für Geschichte und Literärgeschichte der Medicin* . . ." Gotha, 1853, II., p. 422.

undoubted popularity of the *Philonium*. He mentions only the Venice edition of 1502!

Haeser* furnishes a fuller review than Henschel, and has endeavoured to give a complete list of the editions. There is, however, a vagueness about it which renders me doubtful about several of them, especially as he does not seem to have any stronger support than the enumeration in Panckoucke's article.† He also is confused, for he says that Valescus lived at Montpellier from 1382 (which is not certain) and finished his treatise, the fruit of thirty-*eight* years' work, in 1418. These figures do not harmonize with those of Valescus himself.

A portrait of Valescus is contained in the *Ephémerides médicales de Montpellier*, for 1887.‡ I have not had the fortune to see it.

To a certain extent the confusion about the events of his life envelops the editions of the *Philonium* as well. It may, therefore, be convenient to have a digest of those which have been enumerated.

	Mercklin.[1]	Manget.[2]	Eloy.[3]	Panzer.[4]	Panckoucke.[5]	Haeser.[6]	Billings.[7]	Br. Mu.
Lugd.	—	—	—	1478	—	—	—	—
Lugd.	1490	1490	—	1490	—	1490	—	—
Lugd.	—	—	—	1490	—	1490	—	—
Ven.	—	—	1490	—	1490	1490	—	—
Lugd.	—	—	—	1496	—	—	—	—
Lugd.	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	—
Lugd.	—	—	—	1501	—	—	1501	1501
Ven.	—	—	1502	1502	1502	1502	1502	1502
Lugd.	—	—	—	1516	—	1516	—	—

[1] *Lindenius Renovatus*, Norimbergæ, 1686, p. 1037.

[2] *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medicorum*, Genevæ, 1731, II. ii., p. 355.

[3] *Dictionnaire Historique*, Mons, 1778, IV., pp. 458-9.

[4] *Annales Typographici*.

[5] *Biographie Médicale*, n.d., VII., p. 390.

[6] *Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Medezin*, Jena, 1875, I. 712.

[7] *Index Catalogue of the Library of the Surgeon-General's Office*, by John S. Billings, Washington, 1894, XV., pp. 560-1.

---

* *Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Medicin*, Jena, I., pp. 712, 713.

† *Biographie Médicale*, n.d., VII., p. 390.

‡ It is referred to in the *Index Catalogue of the Library of the Surgeon-General's Office*, by John S. Billings, Washington, 1894, XV., p. 561.

	Mercklin.	Manget.	Eloy.	Panzer.	Panckoucke.	Haeser.	Billings.	Br. Mu.
Ven.	1521	1521	1521	—	1521	—	1521	—
Lugd.	—	—	1521	—	1521	1521 (?)	—	—
Lugd.	1526	1526	1526	1526	1526	—	1526	1526
Ven.	1532	1532	1532	—	1532	1532 (?)	—	—
Lugd.	—	—	1535	1535	1535	1535	1535	—
Lugd.	—	—	1560	—	1560	1560	—	—
Ven.	—	—	—	—	—	1589	—	—
Francf.	1599	1599	1599	—	1599	1599	1599	1599
Lugd.	—	—	—	—	—	1599	—	—
Francf. Lpg. u. Jena,	1680	1680	1680	—	1680	1680	1680	1680
Leipz.	—	—	1714	—	1714	1714	—	—

I have examined, and may briefly describe the editions of 1501, 1502, 1526, 1599, 1680 in the British Museum; 1490 in the Hunterian Library; and 1501 and 1535 in my own collection.

The edition of 1478, Lugduni, per Johannem Cleyn, 4to, is quoted by Panzer (*Ann. Typ.* I. 532, 13), from *Catalogus Bibl. Jo. Frid Christii*, Lips. 1757, I., p. 234. He calls it *editio dubia*, and says that the date should probably be 1488, as the name of Cleyn as a printer does not occur earlier. Curiously enough, Hain (No. 15249), who did not know any copy, and simply repeats what Panzer says about the erroneous year, does not quote his remark about Cleyn's own date. As will be seen by the table, this edition was unknown to the older authorities.

For the so-called edition of 1401 see under 1501.

The first edition seems to be the following. There is a copy in the Hunterian Library, University of Glasgow.

f. [1] Title. Practica valeſci de tharanta | que alias philonium dicitur
Verso blank.
f. [2] Tabula, ends f. 3 *verso*.
f. [4] *recto* blank. *Verso* Epistola.
a j Folium I. Incipit Prologus in practica3 | vſualem Ua- | leſci de tharāta etc.
Small folio. 4 ff. a to z, A to Y in eights; or, ff. [4] CCCLX numbered. Double columns. 51 lines. Black letter.
Yviij *recto* col. 2, colophon:
Preclariſſimū op⁹ valeſci de tharāta reuerēdiſſi | mi mgri necnō artis medicine doctoris famoſiſ | ſimi. Finit feliciter Impſſum lugd. p Johānem | trechſel

alemanũ. Anno nr̃e ſaluẽ Milleſimo | quadringẽteſimononageſimo Die vero decimo | nono menſis maij. Amen.

followed by Trechsel's device: I.T in a circle through which rises a line crossed near the top by two lines, one longer than the other; colour white on a red ground.

Trechsel's edition is described by Panzer, I. 541, 88, on the authority of Maittaire, p. 519, and *Catalogus Bibliothecæ Cœnobii Glunicensis in Austria.* Kestner, *Bibl. Medic.*, p. 601.

The second edition was printed at Lyons, "per magistrum mathiam huss alemanum," on the 20th of November, 1490. It is in gothic character, folio, 272 leaves. It is mentioned by Maittaire, p. 519, note 4; by Denis, *Suppl.*, p. 297; Braun, II., p. 203; Panzer, I., 541, 85; and Hain, No. +15251, who gives 267 leaves. I have not seen it.

Another, also dated 1490, is said to have appeared at Venice. I have not seen or heard of an actual copy, but it is noticed by Astruc, Panckoucke, Dezeimeris, and Haeser, who all, probably, simply copied Astruc's statement. Its existence seems doubtful.

The edition of 1496 appeared at Lyons, 14th Oct., in 4to, and was likewise printed by Johann Trechsel. It is mentioned by Denis, *Suppl.*, p. 418. Panzer (I. 549, 155) asks whether it may not be part of a collection entitled: "Amicus medicorum magistri Joannis Ganiueti." This has the same date, place, and printer as Valescus' work, and it is possible that they form part of one whole. Apparently Hain took this view, as he gives a reference to Ganivetus, No. *7467.

Hitherto I have not come across a copy of the edition printed in 1500 by N. Wolff at Lyons, in 4to. It is described in full by Hain (No. *15252), who says it contains 4 ff. not numbered and 364 numbered. Billings' account is as follows:

Practica, que alias Philonium dicitur, una cum Joannis de Tornamira introductorio. 3 p. l., ccclviiii ff. 4to. [*Lugduni.*] [*Ad finem:*] *Impressum per N. Wolff*, 1500.

It seems to be different from the following, which Panzer gives (IV. 73, 677):

Valesci de Taranta Praxis Medica. 1500. fol. Maitt. p. 738.

Mangetus quotes a Lyons edition of 1500, but without specifying the printer. Haller alludes incidentally to a Basel edition of 1500.

Next comes an edition of which I happen to have a copy:

Practica Ualeſci de Tharanta que alꝭ Philoniū dicitur
vna cū olbꝰ Antidotis tam ſimplicibꝰ q cōpoſitis vni-
cuiq3 egritudini a capite vſq3 ad pedes: appropria
tis Johānis Meſue: per alphabetum: a magi-
ſtro Jacobo de partibus doctore Pariſiēſi
celeberrimo: elegāter collectis. et cū non-
nullis ſłomie canonibus cū anatho
mia oſſium adiūctis planiſſime cū
nūero ipſorū ſc3. ccxlviij. abſq3
oſſibus ſiſaminis et oſſe lau-
de sub lingua: valde medi
co perutiliſſimis ex
pluribus doctori
bus emēdatiſ
ſime excer-
ptis

Small folio. 4 leaves AA, a to z, A to Y, in eights, or ff. 12 not numbered, CCCLX numbered. Black letter, with numerous contractions; double columns, 51 lines; head lines and signatures. Title entirely in red.

Collation: 1st leaf, Title; *verso* blank.

2nd leaf, *recto*: ¶ Incipit tabula huiꝰ libri . . . ends on the 4th leaf *recto*.

4th leaf *verso*. Dedication or address to the Chancellor of Montpellier University by Hieronymus Ferrera.

AA1 *recto*. Sūmula Jacobi de partibus, ends AA7 *verso*. 8 is blank.

a1 *recto*. Text of the Philonium begins, and ends Y viij *recto*. ff. 1-CCCLX. *Verso* is blank. At the end of the text is the colophon:

¶ Preclariſſimū opꝰ Ualeſci de Tharāta reue | rendiſſimi magr̄i necnō artis medicine docto- | ris famoſiſſimi. Finit feliciter. Impr̄ſſum lugd̄. | p Johēm Cleyn alemanū. Anno noſtre ſalutis | Milleſimo quadringētesimop'mo, decimoocta | no. kal. Decembris.

This is followed by Cleyn's device, white on a red ground, with the letters I C, which resembles Trechsel's.

Panzer (VII., 277, 10) quotes this edition, and considers the date a simple misprint, for after *quadringentesimo* he puts the word *sic*, and the book is placed under 1501. He quotes (VII., p. 163), *Catal. Bibl. Thottianæ* and *Bibl. Schw. iun.*

The copy in the British Museum, which I have examined since the preceding was written, is the same as my own. Cleyn's device, however, has been cut out, and there is added a folded leaf, equivalent to eight

pages of the book, which contains on the half of one side the picture of a skeleton, with the bones marked with letters, and the corresponding names printed on the rest of the sheet round the picture. On the other side, occupying the whole sheet, is a picture of the veins, with a description of their functions in phlebotomy. This sheet, which was printed by Cleyn, as the type is the same as that used for the *Philonium*, is intended, I presume, to give the insight into the bones and veins referred to in the title. In this copy the tract of Mesue is placed at the end, instead of at the beginning as in mine. The date 1401 is considered a misprint for 1501, and the latter date is assigned to the book in the Museum catalogue.

In 1502 the *Philonium* was reprinted. It is a folio, double columns, gothic character, and contains A to Z, AA, BB, all in fours, and CC in 5 (as the register gives it) or ff. CCIX. There is no title page. At the end is this colophon:

> ¶ Preditiſſimū atq3 ꝑclariſſimū opus Valeſci de tharan- | ta reuerēdiſſimi magiſtri necnō artis medicine doctoris fa | ma ſup ethera noti. vna cū introductorio celeberrimi viri | atq3 medicine doctoris Johānis de tornamira feliciter finit. | Impēſiſq3 nō mediocrit⁹ & cura ſollertiſſima petri liechtē | ſteyn colonienſis aggripine colonie: necnō emendatione | diligentiſſima eſt Impreſſu3 anno. ſalutis. M.ccccc.ij. duo- | decima Kal Martij Venetijs. Sūme & Idiuidue trinitati. | ſit laus: honor & gloria.

The above is from the copy in the British Museum (7306. k. 13 (1).).

This edition is given by Panzer (VIII. 356, 139), and he refers to Gruner's *Aphrodisiacus*, p. 28, not. l., and to Thott, l.c. VII., p. 54.

Under Lugduni, MDXVI. Panzer (VII. 314, 312) quotes the edition printed by Jacobus Myt, Anno ... MCCCCCXVI die vero XI mensis Augusti. 4. He refers to Gruner's *Aphrodisiacus*, p. 28, not. l. Haeser calls it a very elegantly printed edition—eine sehr zierlich gedruckte Handausgabe. I regret I have seen no copy.

Hallervordius* and Mercklin speak of an edition printed in folio at Venice in 1521: Apud hæredes Octaviani Scoti, but they give no particulars. Mangetus and Panckoucke copy from Mercklin. Haeser's edition in

* *Bibliotheca Curiosa*, Regiomonti, 1676, p. 347.

folio of the same date was printed apparently at Lyons, and Panckoucke also gives an edition, Lyons, 1521, in folio. Whether there be two such editions, or whether one of these authorities has made a mistake as to place or date I am unable to say, for I have seen no copy of 1521. I do not even know if Haeser simply quoted Panckoucke without having had access to a copy. This question, therefore, cannot be satisfactorily answered for want of the necessary data. Fabricius (*Bibl. lat.*, p. 873) calls this edition the first erroneously.* Billings describes it as follows:

> Philonium. Aureum ac perutile opus practice medicine operam dantibus, quod Philonium apellatur, consumatissimi medici domini Valesci de Tharanta. Novo ac diligenti examine correctum, novisque et pulchris marginalibus annotationibus exornatum. Introductorius etaim libellus ad practicam medicine partem domini Ioannis de Tornamira. 3 p. l., 223 ff. fol. [*Ad finem:*] *Venetiis impressum cura et sumptibus heredum ... Octaviani Scoti civis Modoetiensis ac sociorum.* 1521.

The edition of 1526 is one of those most frequently referred to. There is a copy in the British Museum (542. a. 2.) of which I can give an account:

> Philonium. | Aureū ac perutile op⁹ | practice medicine ope- | ram dantibus: qd̄ Phi | loniū appellatur: Cō- | ſūmatiſſimi medici do | mini Valeſci de Tha- | ranta. Nouo ac diligē | ti examine correctū. |
>
> Introductorius etiā | libellus ad practicā me | dicine partem domini | Joānis de tornamira. | [Device.]
>
> 8vo. aa 4; a to z, A to Z, AA to GG in eights; or ff. [4] ccccxxiiij. Title in red, except the ornamental border and the device of a cross composed of six small crosses. Gothic letter, double columns, 52 lines. The word "Philonium" is outside the border.
>
> aai Title. On the reverse is a short address to the reader.
>
> aaij: Incipit tabula hui⁹ libri, ends aaiiij *recto*. *Verso* is blank.
>
> aj Text begins fo. i. but not numbered, and ends GGviiij *recto*, fo. ccccxxiiij.
>
> The colophon is as follows:—
>
> ¶ Utiliſſimum atq̄ clariſſimum opus Vale | ſci de tharāta per q3 reuerēdi magiſtr nec- | nō artis medicine doctoris fama ſup ethe | ra noti. vna cū introductorio celeberrimi vi | ri atq3 medicine doctoris Joānis de torna | mira finit feliciter. Impreſſum lugduni per | ſedulū virū Jacobum myt. Anno virginis | partu. M.ccccxxvj. die ⁄o. vj. mēſis Martij. |
>
> The last *page* is blank.

---

* So says Kestner (*Medicinisches Gelehrten-Lexicon*, 1740, p. 834), but I have had no access to the edition referred to. The article in that which I have seen, Florentiæ, 1858, III., p. 570, is inaccurate, though this particular error has been expunged from it.

Myt's edition of 1535 is a reprint of this one.

Panzer, VII., p. 339, 524. He refers to Oertelii *Catalogus Bibl. Scholæ quæ Neustadii ad Aissum floret*, Norumb. 1787, 4to. P. 104.

Haller mentions an edition of 1531, and he is followed by Dezeimeris. No copy of that date has elsewhere come under my observation, and I am doubtful about it.

The edition of 1532 in fol., Venetiis, apud Hæredes Octaviani Scoti is mentioned by Mercklin, Mangetus, Eloy, and Panckoucke. Haeser quotes an edition of the same year, but judging from the arrangement of his list it would seem to have been printed at Lyons.

The first acquaintance with Valescus' book which I made was through a copy of the 1535 edition. The following is an account of it:

Philonium. | Excellētiſſimi ac | optimiſquibuſq3 Practicae Medicinae | ſtudioſis viris longe vtiliſſimum et neceſ- | ſariū opus : quod Philoniū inſcribitur : | preſtantiſſimi necnon conſummatiſſimi | Medici Domini Ualeſci de Tharanta : multoq hactenus fuerit nuper vigilan- | tius emendatum : cui acceſſit. D. Joan. de | Tornamira diligentiſſimi Galeni intro- | ductorius libellus varias morborū curas complectens. | 15 [Device] 35. |

¶ Uenūdātur Lugduni apud Scipio- | nem de Gabiano in vico Mercuriali ſub | inſigni Fontis. |

8vo. Signatures a to z, A to Z, AA to KK, all in eights; or ff. [i-iv] v to ccccxlvij, and one leaf not numbered. Black letter, double columns. The title page is printed in red and black, and is enclosed in four separate different pieces. The device is a fountain.

ai contains the title, on the reverse of which is a short address to the reader.

aij to aiiij *recto:* Tabula, or table of contents; *verso* is blank.

The text begins on a v numbered folio v, and goes down to KKvij *verso*, numbered ccccxlvij. At the end of the text is the register, followed by the colophon, which shows the estimation in which the book was held:

¶ Utiliſſimum atq3 clariſſimum opus Valeſci de tharanta perq reuerendi magiſtri necnon artis medicine doctoris fa ma ſuper ethera noti. vna cū introducto rio celeberrimi viri atq3 medicine docto ris Joannis de tornamira finit feliciter. Impreſſum lugduni per honeſtū virum Jacobum myt Expenſis vero honeſtorum virorum Scipionis de Gabiano et fratrū aſtantium Anno virginis partu. M.CCCCCXXXV. die ño. XX. menſis Aprilis.

The last leaf, not numbered, has the device of a fountain with two cupids and the word LAVAMINI, and round the border the words:

Ego Sitienti Dabo De | Fonte Aquæ | Vivæ Gratis | Apoc. 21.

The *verso* is blank.

The previous edition of 1526 was also printed by Myt. The present one is given by Panzer, VII. 363, 754, who refers to Hirsch, *Millenarius*, II., p. 57; and by Panckoucke, who calls it a 4°. Billings' collation tallies with mine. There is no copy in the Museum.

In the note to the reader, apparently by the publisher, or whoever it was who saw the book through the press, it is stated that this edition has been printed in a compact form, so that physicians, who have to go from place to place, may have a survey of human diseases which they can carry about with them as a "veni mecum," as such a book is called. This therefore was a pocket cyclopaedia of the healing art, as practised at the beginning of the sixteenth century, and may be compared with the analogous works of De Dondis and of Varignana, the former in large folio, the latter in small octavo. All these works are of especial value as illustrative of medicine from 1300 to 1385. There is wanted a good critical account of the natural and medical science of the 14th century, of which less is known than of the 13th, in so far as the men of the later century were by no means so distinguished as their immediate predecessors.

Of the edition of 1560 Haeser, taking his information possibly from Panckoucke, says nothing but that it is in 8vo, and apparently came out at Lyons. I suspect that Haeser means the work of Guido Desiderius (Guy Didier) who was physician of the monastery of Saint Antoine de Vienne. It has the following title:

Epitome operis perquam utilis de morbis curandis Valesci de Taranta. Lyons, 1560, in 8vo.

Hailer commends this epitome.

The Venice edition of 1589 was also in 8vo, and appears to be authentic. It, too, is mentioned by Haeser. I have not seen copies of either edition.

The edition of 1599 (B. M. 547, i. 1) is based on that of Guido Desiderius, amended and enlarged by Joannes Hartmannus Beyerus, and was

printed at Franckfurt, "ex Officina Chalcographica Romani Beati, sumptibus Nicolai Baffæi Bibliopolæ, M.D.XCIX." It is a 4to in eights, and contains):(in six, A to Z, Aa to Vv in eights, Xx in six; or pp.: contents [10, 2 blank], text 677, index [22, 1 blank]. It is a very commonplace book on thin soft paper, which has foxed.

Against the editions of 1560 and 1599 the reader is warned by Astruc.* Another critic says of the 1599 edition that it is curtailed and altered by Beyer, who has not hesitated to add to it a number of Paracelsian ideas.†

Long after, the book was reissued with a preface by Georg Wolfgang Wedel, at Franckfurt and Leipzig, "Sumtibus Joannis Adami Kästneri Bibliop. Jenæ, Typis Joannis NisI, Anno M DC LXXX." Wedel's preface is dated Jena, Cal. Mart. M.DC.LXXX. It also is a 4to, a, b, A to Z, Aa to Zz, Aaa to Zzz, Aaaa to Zzzz, Aaaaa to Vvvvv, or pp.: title, preface, and contents [16], text 871, index [27]. The title page is in red and black; but the book is an ugly seventeenth century quarto. [B. M. 546. g. 19.]

For the edition of 1714 in 4to, I have only Panckoucke's and Haeser's authority. Apparently it was a reissue of the previous edition of Wedel, 1680.

It is obvious that the book enjoyed a very great reputation. The authorities already referred to so often, commend Valescus for his record of original observations, and Conring,‡ a writer who is not lavish of his commendation, makes the following observation: "Valescus item Tarantanus, Regis Franciæ Protomedicus, auctor Philonii, docti ad praxin valde utilis scripti," and afterwards (p. 236) refers to it as "doctum librum."

A commendatory notice of him is given by Freind, who says that

---

* *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de la Faculté de Médecine de Montpellier*, Paris, 1767, 4to, pp. 208-211, where in his notice of Valescus, he gives a brief summary of the *Philonium*, mentions the editions of 1490 and 1521, and, while condemning the above, commends the compilation of Rembert Dodoens, or Dodonæus. I do not see exactly for what reason, because Dodoens makes only three or four brief extracts, which can in no way be compared with a deliberate edition of the book, however badly executed. One would almost suppose that Dodoens' book had not been examined.

† *Dictionnaire Historique de la Médecine Ancienne et Moderne*, par MM. Dezeimeris, Ollivier (d'Angers) et Raige-Delorme. Paris, 1828-1839. 4 tomes, 8vo. I., p. 260.

‡ *In Universam Artem Medicam Introductio*, ed Schelhammer, Spirae, 1688, 4to, p. 103.

"Valescus de Taranta was almost the only one who, about 1400, wrote from experience, and not from books only. . . . He has left us a book call'd *Philonium*, wherein are several good observations relating to the practice of both *Physick* and *Surgery*. . . . And indeed this author interposes his own judgment very often, in some difficult points of Practice: a rare instance in these times, when none had yet scarce begun to think for themselves."* The author of the article in Hirsch's *Lexikon* states that he was one of the lights of the older school at Montpellier, and Portal † has a favourable opinion of Valescus as a practitioner and man of original powers.

The edition of 1680 has been called the best. As none of them are ever likely to serve the modern physician as a *vade mecum*, I should suppose that the early editions will still prove the most attractive from the collector's point of view, irrespective of Haller's insinuation: *Antiqua etiam est nitida, etsi Gothicis literis excusa, editio.* The paper, printing, and *ensemble* of a working quarto of the middle of the seventeenth century form one of the severest trials to which the taste of a bibliophile can be subjected.

13. The various editions of Gregory Reisch's *Margarita Philosophica* having been already enumerated by me (Part V., p. 433), it will be sufficient to tabulate those acquired since my first notice of it. They are—

Strassburg, 1504.	Strassburg, 1512.
Strassburg, 1508.	Strassburg, 1515.

Basel, 1535 and 1583.

Of the 1515 edition there are copies differing in details from one another, so that of that edition, at all events, there were at least two issues. Of the different editions, the first, 1503, is perhaps the most abundant, though the book in one issue or another is not uncommon. But to get a copy in fine condition, clean, unwormed, perfect, especially with the relative map or maps and the music plates, is very difficult indeed. The map has been almost always removed and other illustrations as well. As the bibliography of this book involves much detail,

* *The History of Physick*, London, 1726, Part II., pp. 295–7.

† *Histoire de l'Anatomie*, 1770, I., p. 237.

I intend to consider it more minutely in a separate paper, and at the same time I may possibly give some notion of its contents, as a summary of learning at the close of the fifteenth century.

14. A treatise contemporary with the *Margarita Philosophica* is entitled *Cueur de Philosophie.* Up to the present time this book has not appeared in my "Notes," and it has therefore the attraction of novelty. As to its theme, it deals pretty much with the secrets of Nature generally, not of the Arts, and it covers part of the ground cultivated by Reisch. Like him too, the author selects the catechetical form, and carries on the teaching by question and answer between a disciple and his master.

As the book, like the *Margarita*, deserves more than a mere passing glance, I shall confine myself, for the present, to the bare mention of the editions which I have seen. Those which I have acquired are dated 1521 and 1524. They are both in small 4to, printed in black letter, for François Regnault, Paris. They have a few woodcuts. These are neither in the British Museum, nor are they noticed by Brunet. In the Museum are editions dated 1514 and 1520, and in addition to them Brunet mentions one by Antoine Verard about 1504, and others of 1521, 1529, 1534, and 1538. A copy of Verard's edition I have seen in the Municipal Library at Lille; and quite recently, in the Mazarine Library at Paris, I found an edition of 1530. As this one is not referred to by any bibliographer, I may give here the note which I made upon it:

Senſuit le Cueur de Philoſophie: contenant pluſieurs demandes et queſtions propoſees par le ſaige Placides au Philoſophe Tymeo: Et les reſponces cõtenuz en icelluy. Auec le traictie de Leſpere du mõde Et le Cõpoſt et Kalendrier touchant le cours du ſoleil et de la Lune des feſtes fixes et le biſſexte. Le tout figure: Tranſlate nouuellement de Latin en Francoys. xxx.

[Device.]

+ On les vend a Paris en la grãd Rue ſainct Jacques en Lenseigne de la Rose blanche courõnee par Philippes le Noir Libraire demourãt au dit lieu.

Small 4to. a in six, b to l in fours, m in eight; n to z, A, in fours; B in eight, C to F in fours, G in six; or ff. [6] CXXVI.

Black letter. Numerous woodcuts.

ai Title, in black and red. The device is Aristotle under a tree with an open book on his knee, holding a conversation with a draped female labelled Philosophie. This device has on the two sides a "billet" border alternately red and black, like those in the *Secrets de l'hystoire naturel.*

aii *recto*: La prologue, ends *verso.*

aii *verso*: La table, ends avi *recto.*

avi *verso*: Woodcut of a king seated, a queen (?), a kneeling female, and a man dressed as an ecclesiastic.

bi Text begins and goes to the end, Gvi *verso.* Then the colophon:

Cy finiſt Le Cueur de Philoſophie tranſlate de Latin en
Francoys a la requeſte de Philippes le Bel Roy de
France: Nouuellement Imprime a Paris pour
Philippe le Noir, Lung des deux Relieux iu-
rez: Et Maiſtre Imprimeur a Paris, De-
mourant en la grand Rue Sainct Jac-
ques: A lenſeigne de la Rose blanche
couronnee. Et a eſte acheue dym-
Sic for XXVIII? primer le XXXIII. iour de Mars
M.CCCCC.XXX.

15. Among the Italians who have compiled books of Secrets, I spoke in the first supplement of Guglielmo Varignana. He was one of a family of this name, several of whom were Professors at Bologna.* Bartolomeo, his father, died in 1318-19; he himself died in 1330, and he left two sons, Pietro and Matteo.

Guglielmo, who concerns us at present, wrote a handbook of medical practice, which was not printed till the sixteenth century, but thereafter met with such success as not only to eclipse the fame, but almost to obliterate the

---

* The following are mentioned among the doctors in various faculties at Bologna by Giovanni Nicolo Pasquali Alidosi (*I Dottori Bolognesi di Teologia, Filosofia, Medicina, e d'Arte Liberali dall' anno* 1000, *per tutto Marzo del* 1623, Bologna, 1623, 4to): p. 24, Bartolomeo; p. 47, Domenico; p. 77, Giovanni; p. 79, Guglielmo; p. 140, Matteo; p. 155, Pietro.

An account of Bartolomeo da Varignana and of the castle from which the family name arose is given by Mauro Sarti (*De claris Archigymnasii Bononiensis Professoribus a Sæculo XI. usque ad Sæculum XIV.* Bononiæ, 1769-1772, folio; Tom. I., Part I., p. 480). It is clearly shown that they were of Bolognese, and not of Jewish origin, as some writers have stated.

memory of his father, Bartolomeo, though by contemporaries the latter had been more highly esteemed as a physician. Bartolomeo wrote several treatises, but as they were not printed they had not the fortune to be known to subsequent times in the same way as the volume of medical receipts and secrets by his son.*

The earliest edition I have found mentioned is dated 1519. I have not seen a copy of it, but the title is given by Billings as follows:

> Secreta sublimia ad varios curandos morbos verissimis auctoritatibus illustrata additionibus nonnullis: flosculis item in margine decorata: diligentissime castigata: nusquam impressa feliciter incipiunt. 5 p. l., 129 ff. 1 l. 12° [*Impressum Papiæ, per Magistrum Bernadinum de Geraldis*, 1519].

The year after, an edition was printed at Venice, of which I have been fortunate enough to secure a copy.

> Guilielmi Varignane fecre | ta ſublimia ad varios curandos | morbos veriſſimis auctorita- | tibus illuſtrata additionib⁹ | nōnullis: floſculis ite3 in margine decorata dili | gētiſſime castigata: | nuſq3 impreſſa ſe | liciter inci- | piunt ∴ | ✠ |
>
> Small 8vo. Signatures A–R in eights; or, ff. [8] 127, last leaf, blank (?) wanting. Black letter.
>
> Colophon: ¶ Impreſſum Venetijs per Alexandrum de Bin | donis. Regnante Principe Leonardo Lau- | redano. Anno Domini. M.D.xx. Die | xx. Menſis Nouembris.

This is an attractive little volume of undoubted rarity. It is in Mercklin's† list, from which it is repeated by Haller.‡ There is no copy in the British Museum, but it is also described by Billings.§

The next edition, 1522, likewise occurs in Mercklin's and Haller's enumeration, and the copy which Panzer‖ knew long ago was in the library of the Royal Society.¶ There is none in the British Museum. The following account is given by Panzer, and for the collation I am indebted to Billings:

> Guilielmi Varignane fecreta ſublimia ad varios curandos morbos veriſſimis autoritatibus illustrata additionibus nonnullis floſculis. Item in margine decorata: diligentissime castigata: nusquam impressa feliciter incipiunt. Infigne Vincentii de Portonariis. In fine: Lugduni Impreſſum per Jo. de Cambrey Anno a Virginis partu. 1522. Deo gratias. 4. [3 p. l., lvi. ff. sm. 4°.]

---

* Sarti, *Ibid.* p. 483. † *Lindenius Renovatus*, Norimb., 1686, p. 385.

‡ *Bibliotheca Medicinæ Practicæ*, Bernæ, 1776, I., p. 443.

§ *Index-Catalogue*, 1894, XV., p. 593.

‖ *Annales Typographici*, 1801, IX., p. 519, 465 b.

¶ It is so still. See *Catalogue*, 1883, p. 1083.

The edition which appeared at Lyons in 1526 seems to have been well known, as it is enumerated by Mercklin, Haller, Eloy, Panckoucke, Haeser, and is included in his list by Billings. His collation is: lxxxvii. ff., 3 l. Sm. 4° [*Lugduni, impressum per J. de Cambray*, 1526]. There is a copy of this edition in the library of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society, London.* Mangetus, who took his list from Mercklin, misprints the date 1626, as is pointed out below.

Several other editions are enumerated, but while some are authentic, others appear to me to be simply misdated. The following are those which I have observed:

1531 (?), 21 p. l., 477 pp., 12° Basileæ, per H. Petrum.

Billings gives this, but it seems to be identical with the undated edition in the British Museum, referred to by me in the previous supplement.

An edition of 1536 is mentioned in the *Biographie Universelle*, T. 42, p. 637. I have little doubt that this is a misprint for 1526.

In the first supplement I alluded to an edition of 1539, of which there is a copy in the Museum. It is mentioned by Mercklin, Haller, Eloy, and Haeser. Billings' collation is: lxxvii. ff., 3 l., 12°, Lugduni, J. Flaiollet; which agrees with the copy I have seen. There is a copy of the same date and place, but designated a 4°, in the library of the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow.†

Haeser alone is the authority for an edition of 1540, Venice 8°, but from its being placed between those of 1519 and 1526 in his chronology, I have little doubt it is a misprint for 1520.

The edition of 1545, Basel in 4°, mentioned by Mangetus and by Panckoucke, may possibly be the undated edition I described before. I have not noticed any other reference to such an edition.

The edition of 1597, Basel 8°, edited by Caspar Bauhinus, is that most requently spoken of. I have already mentioned the copy in the British Museum. Billings gives the following collation: 7 p. l., 375 pp., 16° Basileæ per S. Henricpetri. In the Museum copy there are eight pre-

* *Catalogue*, London, 1879, vol. ii., p. 486. The title there given is: *Opus de curandis egritudinibus*. goth. l. 4°. Lugd. 1526.

† *Catalogue*, 1885, p. 645.

liminary leaves. There are copies in the University library, Aberdeen,* and in the library of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society of London.†

Mangetus ‡ quotes an edition of 1626: "Lugd. apud Joh. de Cambray," in 4°. This again, from its coming between the editions of 1520 and 1539, and from its printer, is obviously the 1526 edition with the date misprinted. Besides, he admittedly quotes from Mercklin, who has no edition of 1626, but only of 1526.

Varignana has been commended by several authorities. Conring says of him, when discussing the notable men of the epoch: "Item Guilielmus Varignana, Judæus quantum apparet, vir magnæ eruditionis,"§ and again, "Ad quos tamen adhuc referendus est, qui quasi empiricam curandi morbos rationem tradidit *Guilielmus Varignana*; cujus liber titulo *Secretorum* verissimis auctoritatibus illustratus ad multorum morborum curationem valde juvare nos potest."‖ In a note to this passage (p. 252), Conring compares Fioravanti with Varignana, but gives the former a higher place as being a "rationalising" empiric, who is justified in styling his book *Compendium Secretorum rationalium.* Mangetus ¶ calls him "ſublimis et excellens medicus," and copies Conring as to his nationality. He gives a brief abstract of the book, and quotes the editions from Mercklin.

Portal ** devotes a paragraph to Varignana. He states that according to Conring he was a Jew, that he practised in Genoa, was highly distinguished as an author, and published two works, *Opera Medica* and *Secreta sublimia.*

Pretty nearly the same narrative is repeated by Eloy.†† He mentions the father, and says of Guglielmo that he taught for several years at Bologna, his native place, whence he was called to Genoa, where he wrote his two books, of which he enumerates the following editions respectively: *Secreta*

* *Catalogue*, Aberdeen, 1874, vol. III., p. 294.
† *Catalogue*, London, 1879, vol. II., p. 486.
‡ *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medicorum*, Genevæ, 1731, II. ii., p. 458.
§ *In Universam Artem Medicam Introductio*, ed. Schellhammer, Spiræ, 1688, p. 102.
‖ *Ibid.*, p. 237.
¶ *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medicorum*, Genevæ, 1731, II. ii., p. 458.
** *Histoire de l'Anatomie*, Paris, 1770, I., p. 204.
†† *Dictionnaire Historique*, Mons, 1778, IV., p. 479.

Medicinæ, Papiæ, 1519, 8°; Venet. 1520, 8°; Lugd. 1526, 4°; 1539, 8°; Basil. 1597, 8°. *Opera Medica de curandis morbis*, Basil. 1545, 4°; 1595, 8°; Lugd. 1560, 8°.

These older accounts were examined and criticised by Tiraboschi.* Relying upon the authority of Alidosi and Sarti, quoted above, he shows that his father, Bartolomeo, was a native of Bologna, and of a noble family, and is at a loss to know how he could be thought to be of Jewish extraction. He points out, moreover, that Conring does not say that he was of Jewish origin, as Portal makes him do, but only that he appears to have been Jewish. He does not know any authority for his practising in Genoa, and he believes that the two titles, *De Curandis morbis* and *Secreta sublimia*, refer really to one book, and not to two.

Henschel, a more recent writer than these, and a professed investigator of the history and biography of medicine, curiously enough refers to Conring's statement only as to Hebrew descent. He does not seem to have known about Sarti's inquiry. It looks as if he had better evidence for saying, on the strength of Varignana's own dedication, that his patron was named Meladinus, and was a nobleman of Croatia and Bosnia, and that the author lived latterly in Illyria.†

In Varignana's case, likewise, there seems to be a good deal of obscurity surrounding the events of his life. It may be remarked that the article by Weiss ‡ is based on Tiraboschi's account.

16. Whether Raoul du Mont Vert is the real or fictitious name of the author of the little volume, *Les fleurs et secretz de médecine*, I have not been able to ascertain. The book itself has the merit of originality; it is independent of similar collections. Like many other French books printed early in the sixteenth century, the editions are all rare and little known. I described formerly one of 1547 and a late reprint of 1602, besides enumerating the editions in the British Museum and those noted by Brunet.§ I have recently got other two not in the Museum and omitted

* *Storia della Letteratura Italiana*, Firenze, 1807, t. V., parte I., p. 257.

† *Janus*, 1853, II., p. 390. See full reference in note ‖, p. 194.

‡ *Biographie Universelle*, Paris, 42, p. 637.

§ Part V., p. 441.

by Brunet. Both are undated, and both are in small 8vo, printed in black letter. One of them has no place or printer's name, the other issued from the press of Alain Lotrian and Denis Janot at Paris, and may therefore have appeared as early as 1520. This work requires fuller consideration than I can give it here at present, and I hope to subject it to a special examination.

17. A much-esteemed book must have been Vicary's *Englishman's Treasure*, which was edited and enlarged and supplemented by William Bremer. The earliest edition that I was able to submit formerly to the Society was printed by Thomas Creede at London, 1596, in black letter, Part V., p. 454. There was also a very dilapidated copy, certainly dated 1696, and purporting to be of the seventh edition, Part IV., p. 306. Another copy, however, of the seventh edition was dated 1626, and this agrees better with those now to be described.

The first edition seems to be that imprinted at London by John Windet for John Perin in 1586. It is a small black letter quarto: 5 preliminary leaves, B to L, A, Bb to Dd in fours, Ee in two, or pp. [10] 115 [1 blank]. It contains Vicary's Anatomy, Remedies for Wounds, various medical receipts, Urines, of the Bath of Baeth. In the later editions much matter was added to the original book.

The next copy I have to show is of the sixth edition; it was "Imprinted at London by Thomas Creede, 1613." It is a small 4to, in black letter, pp. [8] 224 [8]. It has the dedication to the Governors of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, a short note "To the Reader," Vicary's address to the Surgeons, and the picture of the human skeleton, Vicary's True Anatomy, Secrets of Chirurgerie, of Medicine and of Vrines, the English Baths, and a collection of medicinal preparations, waters, oyntments, plaisters, etc., by G. E., and the last eight pages contain an index. There is no plate of the blood-vessels in this edition as there is in that of 1641. This is rather a neat little book.

The eighth edition, a copy of which is in the Hunterian Library and in the British Museum (1039. g. 7), was printed at London by Alsop and Fawcet in 1633. It is exactly like those of 1626 and 1641, being in 4to and black letter, pp. [8] 264 [8]. It does not, however, contain the diagram

of the skeleton of the 1626 or of the veins of the 1641 edition. In the 1641 edition there are receipts, pp. 246-272, which are not in that of 1633.

That of 1641, just mentioned, is the ninth edition, and it too was printed by B. Alsop and Tho. Favvcet. The two editions are in exactly the same style, in small quarto and in black letter. There are a few minor changes in the title page, the most important being that, in the seventh edition, the additions about waters and medicines, etc., etc., are ascribed to G. E., Practitioner, whereas, in the ninth edition, they are ascribed to W. B., who, according to the Museum catalogue, is William Boraston. There are a good many alterations in the arrangement of the two editions, and the ninth is undoubtedly considerably enlarged. It contains pp. [12, including the frontispiece], 292, [15, 1 blank]. The colophon runs thus, on a leaf marked Rr.:

> London, | Printed by B. Alsop and Tho: Favvcet, |
> dwelling in *Grubſtreet*, neere to the lower | Pumpe, 1641. |

This copy is in about as good condition as a book of its date and character could be—clean, crisp, with the frontispiece of the blood-vessels, perfect in every way, and in old sheep binding with clasps. Another copy of the same edition I have seen from Mr. Hailstone's library in equally fine state.

The first tract, Vicary's Anatomy, is the oldest treatise on the subject in English. It was originally printed in 1548, but apparently no copy of it has survived. It was reprinted in 1577, and the so-called unique copy of this edition has served for a reprint by the Early English Text Society in 1888. It is No. LIII. of the Extra Series. Vicary belonged to St. Bartholomew's Hospital, and he compiled his tract for the special instruction and guidance of surgeons. Thereafter it became a sort of St. Bartholomew text-book, and all the editions enumerated down to this one were dedicated to the Governors of the Hospital.

It is a collection of some importance, for it represents several sides of the practical and medical knowledge of the time, and it was considered authoritative, seeing that it continued in use for over a century. The tract on the plague, in the ninth edition, reveals the terrors under which people lay, before they had sufficient knowledge to discriminate between natural

phenomena and their own superstitions. The seven prognostics of the plague are instructive from this point of view, and what is said may be compared with another little treatise on the same lugubrious theme: ΛΟΙΜΟΤΟΜΙΑ, *or the Pest anatomized*, by George Thomson, London, 1666, in 16°.*

---

* [January, 1897. These works might be considered of special interest just now, when precautions are being taken to prevent an incursion of the plague from India to Europe.]

ERRATA IN THE FIRST SUPPLEMENT.

Transactions (N.S.) II.

Page 372, line 2, Reprint page 9, *delete* as follows.
Page 403, line 22, Reprint page 40, *for* seems *read* seem.
Page 403, line 24, Reprint page 40, *for* 1559 *read* 1599.

No. VI.

A SMALL BRASS CUP FOUND IN THE GRAVEYARD OF THE CHURCH OF ST. CLEMENT, RODIL, HARRIS

WITH

A NOTE ON THE CHALICE

BY

DAVID MURRAY, LL.D., F.S.A.,
PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY.

[*Read at the Meeting of the Society held on 20th February*, 1896.]

THIS small chalice-shaped vessel was found in the graveyard of the old church of St. Clement, at Rodil, in the island of Harris. It is of brass, or bell metal, and consists, like the proper chalice, of three distinct parts or members[1]—the cup or bowl, the stem or shaft, and the foot. The foot is circular and flat, the stem is round and in its middle there is a projecting ring or moulding resembling the knop or knot[2] of the chalice. The weight of the vessel is 7 oz. and its height 3½ inches. The cup is a trifle over 1½ inches in depth; it is bell-mouthed, spreading out at the mouth, where it is 2 inches across, including the thickness of the metal.[3] The lip is consequently slightly turned over.

---

[1] Described by Mr. Octavius Morgan in *Archaeologia*, vol. xlii., p. 413. As to the ancient manufacture of the chalice, see Theophilus, *De diversis Artibus*, cc. xxvi., xxvii., xlii., xliii., pp. 230-260, ed. Hendrie (London, 1847, 8vo).

[2] German, *Knauf*; French, *nœud*; Latin, *nodus*. Knop is said to be preferable to knot in English usage. *Archaeological Journal*, viii., pp. 144, 145; xlvii., p. 430; but see *The Reliquary*, v., N.S. (1891), p. 140.

The célebrant holds the chalice by the knop (*tenens illius nodum*). Rubric of the Mass in the *Missale Romanum*; De Vert, *Explication des Cérémonies de l'Église*, iii., pp. 177, 269, 377 (Paris, 1709-13, 8vo); Baldeschi, *Ceremonial according to the Roman Ritual*, translated by Dale, p. 100 (London, 1873, 4th ed.).

[3] These dimensions compare with the coffin chalice found in Rhôscrowther Churchyard, Pembrokeshire, *infra*, p. 229; and with those of the Hexham chalice, *infra*, p. 230.

There are several varieties of the ecclesiastical chalice[1]—the pontifical chalice (*calix major*), used on occasions of festival; the ordinary mass chalice (*calix minor, s. quotidianus, s. offertorius*); the travelling chalice (*calix itinerarius, s. gestatorius*); and the funeral or coffin chalice (*calix funerarius*). The latter was not a consecrated vessel, but was enclosed in the coffin of any ecclesiastic who had received priest's orders.[2] In addition to these there was, in early times, before the cup was withheld from the laity (a practice which commenced at the close of the twelfth century and was confirmed by the Council of Constance in 1414), the ministerial or sacramental chalice (*calix ministerialis*), a large vessel which contained the consecrated wine, from which it was distributed to the people.[3]

Rodil Cup.

[1] The subject of the chalice is very fully treated by L'abbé Corblet, *Histoire du Sacrement de l'Eucharistie*, ii., pp. 222, 239 *sqq.* (Paris, 1886, 8vo), and by Rohault de Fleury in his great work, *La Messe*, vol. iv., pp. 45-153 (Paris, 1887); Bapst, *L'Etain*, p. 77 *sqq.* (Paris, 1884); Piscara, *Praxis Caerimoniarum*, p. 21 (Venet., 1681, 4to). See also John Doughty, *De calicibus Eucharisticis* (Bremae, 1694, 8vo). John Doughty was an English churchman, and therefore heterodox, from the Roman standpoint, but referred to by Cardinal Bona, *Res Liturgicae*, ii., p. 301, August. Taur., 1749, fol.

[2] Martene, *De antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus*, Lib. iii., cc. 12. 11; tom. ii., p. 368 (Bassani, 1788, fol.); Moroni, *Dizionario di Erudizione storico-ecclesiastica*, vol. vi., p. 198, s.v. *Cadavere*; vol. lxiv., p. 152, s.v. *Sepoltura*; *Pontificale Romanum*, iii., p. 360 (ed. Catalan, Paris, 1851-2, 4to); Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, p. 9 n. (Oxon., 1679, fol.); Maskell, *Monumenta ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, i., p. 134 (Oxford, 1882, 2nd ed.); Reusens, *Archéologie Chrétienne*, i., pp. 215, 413; ii., p. 347 (Louvain, 1871-75, 8vo); Durandus, *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, vii., 35, §§ 40, 41; Bapst, *L'Etain*, p. 100 *sqq.*

A waxen cross-shaped seal (*sigillum*), containing holy water, was placed on the head of a layman in token of his baptism and Christianity. In the case of an ecclesiastic the chalice was substituted and was laid upon his breast. A paten was often placed alongside the chalice, and priests were also occasionally buried in vestments, either entirely vested or with a surplice and stole. A monk was sometimes buried with his cowl.

[3] Moroni, *Dizionario di Erudizione storico-ecclesiastica*, vol. vi., s.v. *Calice*, p. 256 *et*

The material of the chalice was of various kinds. "In the primitive church," says Durandus,[1] "the sacrifice was offered in vessels of wood and in common vestments, for then were chalices of wood and priests of gold, whereof the contrary is now."[2] Pope Zephirinus (202-218) decreed that the Mass should be offered in glass,[3] but because such vessels were easily broken Pope Urban and the Council of Rheims (A.D. 874) ordered that gold or silver vessels should be used; or, on account of poverty, of pewter or tin,[4] which rusteth not, but not in wood or in brass. Therefore

---

sqq.; Richard et Giraud, *Bibliothèque Sacrée*, tom. v., s.v. (Paris, 1822); Wetzer et Welte, *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique de la Théologie Catholique*, tom. iii., s.v. *Calice* (French translation by Goschler, Paris, 1858); Martigny, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Chrétiennes*, s.v. (Paris, 1877); Gerbert, *Vetus Liturgia Alemannica*, i., p. 221 (1776, 4to); Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus completus*, tom. 127, pp. 1511, 1515, 1547; *Pontificale Romanum*, ii., p. 350 (ed. Catalan, Paris, 1851, 4to); *Archaeological Journal*, iii., p. 130; Hefele, *Beiträge*, ii., pp. 322-330, "Zur Archäologie des Kelches" (Tübingen, 1864, 8vo); Giefers, *Ueber den Altar-Kelch* (Paderborn, 1856, 4to), a small tract of 15 pages.

It was at one time the practice to fill the ministerial chalice with common wine, into which the celebrant poured a small quantity of the contents of his mass chalice. Both the clergy and the people drank from a tube, not from the rim of the chalice.

[1] Durandus, *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, i., 3, § 45; see also Honorius Augustodunensis, *Gemma Animae*, i., c. 89, *Opera* (ed. Migne, 1854, *Patrologiae Cursus completus*, tom. 172), p. 573.

[2] This saying is found in the 18th canon of the Council of Tribur (A.D. 895), Labbe, *Concilia*, xviii., p. 142 (ed. Mansi, Venet. 1783); Gratianus, Can. xliv., "De Consecratione," in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, *Decretum Gratiani*, pars iii., dist. i., c. 44. It has been attributed to St. Boniface by Walafridus Strabo, *De Rebus Ecclesiasticis*, c. 24; *Opera*, ii., ed. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus completus*, tom. 114, p. 951; see also Durandus. *De ritibus Ecclesiae Catholicae*, i., 7. 2, p. 68 (Paris, 1632); Picard, *Ceremonies et coutumes religieuses*, i., pt. ii., p. 123 (Amst., 1723, fol.).

[3] See Anastasius Bibliothecarius, *Liber Pontificalis*, in Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus completus*, tom. 127, pp. 1307, 1312.

[4] The Latin *stannum*, French *étain*, means either tin or pewter. As regards vessels, what is meant is, I believe, not tin but pewter. Tin itself is not suitable for working. Pewter is a compound of tin and lead, and is whiter, harder, and easier to work than tin. What are known in commerce as tin vessels are made of tin plates,—the Scotch *white iron*,—that is, thin iron plates dipped in molten tin.

There are some interesting articles on old English pewter in *The Reliquary*, N.S., v. (1891), pp. 20, 72; vi. (1892), p. 148; vii. (1893), p. 202.

it might not be in glass[1] on account of the danger of effusion; nor of wood, since being porous or spongy it absorbeth the Blood; nor of brass, nor of bronze, the rust of which is unseemly.[2] Richard, Archbishop of Canterbury (1174-1184), appointed[3] that the Eucharist should not be consecrated save in a chalice of gold or silver.[4] The rubric of the Mass directs that the chalice be of gold or silver, or should at the least have the cup silvered or gilt inside.[5]

Kremsmünster Cup.[6]

Two chalices of pewter of the 7th century have been preserved—Bapst, *L'Etain*, p. 87, where one is figured. At Troyes there are grave chalices of pewter of the 12th and 13th centuries. Bapst, *Op. laud.*, p. 101; *La Grande Encyclopédie*, viii., s.v. *Calice*; xvi., s.v. *Etain*.

[1] See "Note on a chalice of glass ornamented with figures, found at Hombliéres, in the department of Aisne, France," in *Bulletin Mensuel de numismatique et d'archéologie*, vi. (1886-90), p. 5 (Bruxelles, 8vo).

[2] Gratianus, Can. xliv. and xlv., "De Consecratione," *Corpus Juris Canonici, ut supra*; Durandus, *Op. laud.*; see also Chambers, *Divine Worship in England*, p. 251 (London, 1877, 4to); Reichel, *Manual of Canon Law*, i., p. 101 (London, 1896, 8vo).

[3] Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, iii., 23, p. 234 (Oxon. 1679, fol.); Doughty, *De calicibus Eucharisticis*, p. 115; Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, ii., p. 533.

[4] Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, iii., tit. 23, p. 234 (Oxon. 1679, fol.). Giraldus Cambrensis, in his *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, dist. i., c. 10 (*Opera*, ii., p. 36, Rolls Series), "Let the chalice be of gold or silver, or if the church be very poor, at least of pewter sound and pure" (*stagneus integer et purus*). He repeats this in the *Speculum Ecclesiae*, iv., 30 (*Opera*, iv., p. 332).

[5] *Missale Romanum*, p. xxiii. (August. Taur., 1874, 4to); *Missale Romano-Monasticum*, p. 20 (Ratisbonae, 1873, fol.). The Congregation of Rites (20 March, 1875, Dec. 6 and 9) interdicted chalices having the bowl of copper gilt, but under certain conditions allowed aluminium-bronze.

[6] I am indebted to Messrs. Virtue & Company for the use of this illustration.

but is generally from three to six inches in diameter, and of proportionable depth. The stem is from four to six inches in height.[1]

The travelling chalice is very much smaller,[2] and is often made so that it can be taken to pieces, with a small box (*capsa*) for the host, and a paten attached by a screw.[3]

It has been the practice from very ancient times to consecrate the chalice used in the service of the altar,[4] the consecration or hallowing

---

oculis offert, dicens *offerimus*," etc. Piscara, *Praxis Caerimoniarum*, p. 238 (Venet., 1681, 4to). See also the Rubric of the Mass in the *Missale Romanum*; and Quarti, *Rubricae Missalis Romani*, p. 208 (Venet., 1727, fol.).

The knop (*nodus*), says Gavanti, if ornamented, must be so that when the chalice is grasped this may not be inconvenient, especially at the time when the thumb and fore finger must not be separated. Gavanti, *Thesaurus sacrorum Rituum*, ed. Merati, vol. ii., pt. v., p. 272 (Venet., 1823, 4to); Bauldry, *Manuale sacrarum Caerimoniarum*, p. 313 (Venet., 1778, 4to); *Selections from C. Merati on the Ceremonies of the Church*, p. 97 (London, 1837, 12mo).

[1] Pugin, *Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament*, s.v. Chalice; see *Glossary of Liturgical and Ecclesiastical Terms*, s.v. Chalice (London, 1877); "List of Mediaeval Chalices," *Archaeological Journal*, vol. xliii., p. 364 *et sqq.*, Reprint of Hope and Fallows' paper, p. 27 *et sqq.* The chalice, says Gavanti, must not exceed in its entire circumference 14 or in its height 12 inches (Italian). *Thesaurus sacrorum Rituum*, p. 272. See also Picard, *Ceremonies et Coutumes religieuses*, i., pt. ii., p. 123.

[2] Mr. Fallow describes a small medieval chalice, height 5 inches, diameter of the bowl $2\frac{7}{8}$ inches, and of the base $3\frac{3}{8}$ inches by $2\frac{5}{16}$ inches, and weighing $4\frac{1}{4}$ ounces, which was probably a travelling chalice. *The Reliquary*, N.S., ii. (1888), p. 145.

[3] Mueller und Mothes, *Archaeologisches Wörterbuch*, s.v. Kelch (Leipzig, 1877). One of the 13th century is figured, Reusens, *Archéologie Chrétienne*, ii., p. 347 (Louvain, 1871-75, 8vo). One of silver gilt of the 15th century is preserved in the Abbey of Klosterneuborg in Austria. Its height when set up is $0^{m.}$ 125, when taken down and the pieces fitted into one another $0^{m.}$ 50. Corblet, *Histoire du Sacrement de l'Eucharistie*, ii., p. 241. It is figured, Gay, *Glossaire Archéologique*, s.v. Calice, p. 255.

[4] A prayer for the purpose is found in the Gregorian Sacramentary, as well as in the most ancient *Ordines Romani*, but no mention is there made of chrism. *Pontificale Romanum*, ii., p. 357 *et sqq.* (ed. Catalan, Paris, 1851-52, 4to). For the prayers used in the early English Church, see Chambers, *Divine Worship in England*, p. 250 (London, 1877, 4to). As to consecration of new communion plate in the reformed Church of England, see Owen, *History of Consecration*, p. 86 (London, 1706, 4to).

being made by a bishop[1] with chrism.[2] A consecrated vessel only might be used for the sacrament,[3] and it should bear the sign of consecration. This is a small cross engraved or embossed on the foot,[4] which the priest keeps towards himself at the time of celebration.[5]

It is doubtful whether there is now extant a single pre-Reformation Scottish chalice.[6] Scotland was not a rich country, but it had a fair quantity of valuable communion plate. The cathedral of Glasgow had,

---

[1] In the accounts of the churchwarden of the parish of Wing, in the county of Buckingham, for the year 1553, in the reign of Queen Mary, the following entry occurs: "It., gevyn in rewarde to the byschope of Oxford servnt for hys peynes takyng at the holynge of the chalyce & ye corporus, vi^{d}." *Archaeologia*, xxxvi., p. 232.

Some abbots had certain episcopal privileges; amongst others, that of conferring the minor orders upon their monks and consecrating the furniture of the altar, including the chalice and paten. *Pontificale Romanum, ut supra*, ii., pp. 358, 372. *Summula Raymundi*, f. 45 (ed. Chappuis, Paris, 1525, 8vo). The abbot of Aberbrothock, for instance, had this privilege. *Registrum nigrum de Aberbrothoc*, p. 52 (Bannatyne Club).

[2] The prayers used are given in the *Pontificale Romanum*. See also *The Pontifical of Egbert, Archbishop of York*, A.D. 732-766, p. 47 (Surtees Society, Durham, 1853); *Liber Pontificalis of Edmund Lacy, Bishop of Exeter ... of the 14th century*, p. 238 (Exeter, 1847, 8vo); Owen, *History of Consecration*, pp. 75, 79 (London, 1706, 4to).

[3] This is directed by the Rubric in the *Missale Romanum*. See also *Pontificale Romanum, ut supra*, ii., p. 354.

[4] The chalice found at Gourdon, and which is not later than the early part of the 6th century, wants the Christian symbol, but the paten found along with it bears a cross.

In some instances where a pre-Reformation chalice continued to be used by the Protestants, the cross was cut out and a new piece of metal inserted. *Archaeologia*, xxxvi., p. 490.

[5] Cripps, *Op. laud.*, p. 186; Pugin, *Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament*, s.v. Chalice.

[6] Burn, *Old Scottish Communion Plate*, p. 187 (Edinb. 1892, 4to); "Chalices in Wiltshire and in Scotland" in *The Reliquary*, N.S., vol. vi. (1892), p. 154. A fragment of a chalice of Venetian glass was found amongst the ruins of Lindores Abbey, but there is no indication whether it was an altar chalice. Laing, *Lindores Abbey*, p. 139 (Edinb. 1886, 4to).

A golden chalice, part of the spoil of Iona, was preserved in a Roman Catholic church in Glasgow until 1845, when it was stolen and melted. Wilson, *Prehistoric Annals of Glasgow*, ii., p. 483.

in 1432, a gold chalice and paten, four great silver chalices, well gilt, for festival occasions, with their patens; and there were in the custody of the sacrist four gilt chalices, two chalices of silver, not gilt, for the altar of the Blessed Virgin, presented by David de Cadyhou; one chalice of silver given by the deceased Master John de Hawyk for the altar of St. Peter; and one chalice of silver for the altar of St. John the Baptist founded by John Stewart, formerly subdean.[1] The abbey of Holyrood had twelve chalices, one of gold weighing with the paten 46 oz.[2] The cathedral of Aberdeen had in the treasury, in 1549, eleven chalices of silver,—one a *calix major*,—for the daily service of the church. There were others, the special gifts of various persons; one, presented by Bishop William Stewart, of Paris work; another, of pure gold weighing 3 lbs. 3 oz. troy, with three loadstones and two rubies at the foot of the crucifix, which was presented along with three others of silver by Bishop Gawan Dunbar.[3] Every parish church had one or two.[4] A few of those which existed at the Reformation may have been conveyed to the Continent; but the greater part was undoubtedly converted into bullion[5] and sold shortly after the Reformation.[6] The spoliation had begun even earlier. In 1550 John Lokhart of Bar and Charles Campbell of Bargour were denounced rebels for not appearing to answer to the charge of "theftuous and violent carrying off, depredation, southrief, and spoliation furth of sundry parish churches,

---

[1] *Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis*, ii., p. 331.

[2] "Inventorium Jocalium Altaris Monasterij S. Crucis," in *Miscellany of the Bannatyne Club*, ii., p. 24.

[3] *Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis*, ii., pp. 180, 184, 186; List of 1436, see *Ib.*, p. 143.

[4] The statutes of the Synod of Aberdeen of the 13th century provide that every church is to have a silver chalice with becoming vessels. *Statuta Ecclesiae Scoticanae*, ii., p. 35. Cf. Wilkins, *Concilia*, i., p. 587.

[5] *e.g.* 10 December, 1563. The Counsale of Peebles "ordanis ane of the chalice quhilk is in the stiple to be maid money of to the thesawrar and farther at the baillies plesour." *Records of the Burgh of Peebles*, p. 291 (Burgh Records Society).

[6] The spoilers of Aberdeen cathedral shipped a large part of the plunder, intending to sell it in Holland, "but all this ill-gotten wealth sank by the just judgment of God not far from Girdleness." *Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis*, i., p. lxvi.

religious houses, and chapels within the shires of Lanark, Renfrew, and the stewartries of Kyle, Carrick, and Cunninghame, of sundry Eucharistic chalices, altars, and ornaments of the Mass: And also, for casting down and breaking choral stalls and other stalls, and glazed windows, etc.," in the years 1545-48.[1]

The different view of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper taken by the Protestants from that of the Roman Catholics led to the disuse and consequent destruction of consecrated cups, and the substitution of common vessels,[2] a course which shocked the religious feelings of the old clergy. "Sen ye weschelis and ornamentis appropriat to ye service of God, suld nocht," says Ninian Winzet of Renfrew, "be prophanit in wthir commoun vseis: as the feirfull exemple of Balthazar preuis maist planelie: Quhy hef ye wappit doun al ye affixit tabellis of ye Lord, be al auncient fatheris afoir our dayis callit altaris, togiddir with ye font of Baptism, and vseis zour tabillis, baissinis, and coupis furth of ony prophane taueroun."[3]

The small size of the present vessel might suggest that it was a travelling chalice, and its presence in the graveyard might be accounted for by its having been used in the old chapel by a missionary priest during the period when it was contrary to law to celebrate mass. In early times during persecution, and under the pressure of great necessity, the Church no doubt has "allowed every kind of vessel to hold the wine

---

[1] Pitcairn, *Criminal Trials*, i., p. 353*. See also a case of loss of a silver chalice and theft of the paten, *Records of the Burgh of Peebles, ut supra*, p. 255 (5 July, 1559).

[2] See *Archaeological Journal*, xlvii., p. 50, where there is quoted Archbishop Parker's Visitation Articles, No. 5:—"Whether the curate or minister do minister in any profane cups, bowls, dishes, or chalices heretofore used at mass, or else in a decent communion cup kept for the purpose." Again, *Op. laud.*, p. 427, where the Injunctions of the first year of Edward VI. (1547) and the visits to each parish in England of the king's commissioners to see if there remained any "monuments of idolatry, superstition, and hypocrisy" are referred to. See likewise *Archaeologia*, xlii., p. 411.

The word "chalice" was expunged from the Prayer Book of "1552," along with the words "altar" and "mass."

[3] Winzet, *The Buke of Four Scoir Thre Questions*, Qu. 28 (Antverpiae, 1563); Winzet's *Tractatis*, p. 84 (Maitland Club). He also complains (Qu. 61) that the Protestants sold "the goldin and wtheris thingis of gold and siluir," and reserved the worst.

of the sacrifice and to become the receptacle of the Precious Blood,"[1] but a brass vessel would probably not have been used by a missionary priest in the post-Reformation period, as he could just as well have carried one of silver or pewter.[2] It is also unusual to employ a cup with a turned-over lip;[3] but apart from this, there is no cross upon it, and it cannot therefore have been hallowed or used for the service of the altar.[4] The church of Rodil seems to have been used for Protestant worship from shortly after the Reformation; a missionary priest could therefore scarcely have obtained access to it, and even if he could it is unlikely that he would celebrate Mass in what was to him a desecrated place.[5] It is probable, therefore,

---

[1] Bridgett, *History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain*, i., p. 173 (London, 1881, 8vo); Bocquillot, *Traité historique de la Liturgie sacrée*, p. 177 (Paris, 1701, 8vo). The question is put in the *Summula Raymundi* (f. 46, ed. Paris, 1525), "Aliquem sacerdotem celebrare cum tali calice an conficiet? Respondetur quod hoc non debet fieri sed si fiat nicholominus conficiet et erit verum corpus Christi et verus sanguis."

But see Wetzer et Wette, *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique de la Théologie Chrétienne*, tom. iii., p. 433. Quarti, *Rubricae Missalis Romani*, p. 142 (Venet., 1727 fol.).

[2] Indeed the question is raised whether it would not be a mortal sin to use a bronze or brass cup. Quarti, *Op. laud.*, p. 140.

[3] The brim must not be turned over at all. Gavanti, *Thesaurus Sacrorum Rituum*, p. 272 (Venet., 1823); *Selections from C. M. Merati on the Ceremonies of the Church*, p. 97 (London, 1837, 12mo). The object is to prevent spilling. See *Glossary of Liturgical and Ecclesiastical Terms*, s.v.; Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*, s.v. But some early chalices had a quasi lip. *Archaeological Journal*, xliii., p. 142.

[4] The absence of the cross is not absolutely conclusive against a vessel being intended for the altar. Simple priests could in certain circumstances consecrate the chalice, and Paul III. in 1549 granted a dispensation to Jesuits *in partibus infidelium* and out of the reach of a bishop, to make the consecration; and the same privilege has been conceded to some other Orders, and has been granted by many Popes to missionary priests. Moroni, *Dizionario di Erudizione storico-ecclesiastica*, vol. vi., p. 259, s.v. *Calice*. Quarti, *Op. laud*, p. 141; Corblet, *Histoire du Sacrement de l'Eucharistie*, ii., p. 223.

If consecration took place in circumstances that rendered the concealment of the chalice desirable, it may be that the marking of the cross on the vessel might have been omitted.

[5] He might do so on a portable altar with consent or license of the bishop. Cf. Council of Rheims of 1583; Labbe, *Concilia*, xv., p. 893 (ed. Paris, 1672, fol.). The rule is thus stated by St. Raymond of Penaforte, "Item non debet cantari Missa, nisi in Ecclesia consecrata, si fieri potest, vel saltem in altari consecrato; vel si hoc non habetur, habeatur ad minus semper parva tabula consecrata. In necessitate etiam potest Missa celebrari sub dio,

that the vessel was a grave or coffin chalice, and that it accompanied the interment of a priest. Such chalices generally were not hallowed, and were of inferior material. They may in some cases have been made purposely small, like the "baby celts" of Ireland, and the doll-like scissors of Germany.

It was a common custom in pre-Christian times to accompany an interment with such articles as the deceased would require in the future life. The Christian Church continued the practice, but with the object of indicating the calling of the person buried. Alongside the warrior his sword was laid; a chalice, or a chalice and paten, accompanied the interment of a priest,[1] in the case of a bishop there was sometimes a crosier in addition.[2] Thus, a chalice and a pastoral staff were placed on the body of St. Birin, the first bishop of Dorchester (*circa* 650), and were found when his tomb was opened in 1224.[3] When the tomb of Archbishop Hubert (1193–1205) in Canterbury Cathedral was opened in 1890, a crozier or chalice of base silver and a paten lay beside the body.[4] A real chalice was, in some cases buried with an ecclesiastic of rank, but this was an exception. Two large chalices of gold were found in the coffin of an Archbishop of York, and are now used for holding communion in the cathedral, and a number of others are mentioned by Mr. W. H. St. John Hope and Mr. T. M. Fallow in their interesting paper on

---

vel in tentoriis, in itinere videlicet, vel in exercitu, vel simili honesto loco; dum tamen habeatur ibi semper parva tabula ut dictum est, et cetera ornamenta necessaria." *Summa S. Raymundi*, iii. 24 (p. 312, ed. Venet., 1744, fol.). The passage is taken from the *Decretum Gratiani*, P. iii., de consecratione dist. i. can. 12 and 30, and is founded on the 9th chapter of the Council of Mayence held in 888. St. Raymond was General of the Dominican Order, and although an excellent canonist has the not altogether enviable distinction of having introduced the Inquisition into Aragon. Cf. *Summa Confessorum* of John of Friburg, iii. 24, Qu. 131 (f. 127, ed. Lugduni, 1518, fol.).

[1] "Pour le calice et la platine d'estain pour mettre en le fosse (d'un chanoine), comme il est de coutume en tel cas à faire, 12s." Houdoy, *Comptes de Cambrai*, 390, quoted Gay, *Glossaire archéologique*, s.v. Calice, p. 254.

[2] d'Achery, *Spicilegium*, ii., p. 161 (Paris, 1723, fol.).

[3] Surius, *De probatis Sanctorum historiis*, vi., p. 688 (Col. Ag., 1575, fol.).

[4] *The Reliquary*, N.S. iv. (1890), p. 133.

"English Mediaeval Chalices and Patens."[1] A cup of the eleventh century was found in the tomb of the Bishop Frederick of Münster (who died 1084), and is preserved in the Mauritius Church, Münster.[2] It is of brass and is void of ornament, but has an engraved cross on the foot It is finely proportioned, and resembles in form the conventional chalice represented on Scottish sepulchral slabs,[3] the base being nearly a counter part of the bowl, standing end to end with a thick bulb between. Along with the body of St. Cuthbert there was found, when his relics were examined in 1104, a small gold chalice with paten,[4] as also a small portable altar;[5] a fine chalice of enamelled copper of the twelfth century was dug up, with a paten or cover of gilded copper, in the graveyard of the Nunnery of Rusper in Sussex.[6]

The Constitutions of William of Blois, of the year 1230, direct that every church there should be at the least two chalices—one of silver, which Mass is to be celebrated, and the other of pewter or tin, not consecrated (*alius stanneus non benedictus*), with which the priest of the altar is to

---

[1] *Supra*, p. 218. See also Drake, *History and Antiquities of York*, ii., p. 481. *Archaeological Journal*, iii., p. 136. *The Reliquary*, N.S. vi. (1892), p. 156.

A paten and chalice of silver were found buried in the earth near Dolgelly, in Wales in 1890. They were probably of the 14th century. The two together weighed 46 oz and were sold by auction at Christie, Manson & Wood's in 1892, and fetched £7 *Archaeological Journal*, xlix., p. 83, where they are described by Mr. W. Cripps, and figured. See also Cripps, *Old English Plate*, p. 190 (ed. 1894); *The Reliquary*, N.S., (1890), p. 181.

[2] Lubke, *Op. laud.*, p. 139; Rohault de Fleury, *La Messe*, iv., p. 121.

[3] See, for instance, slab at Saddell. White, *Archaeological Sketches*, i., pl. xli.

[4] Eyre, *The History of St. Cuthbert*, pp. 164, 175 (1887, 3rd ed.); Smith, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, i., p. 339, s.v. Chalice.

[5] As to portable altars (*altare portatile, s. altare viaticum; s. tabula itineraria, s. lapis itinerarius*), see *Pontificale Romanum, ut supra*, ii., p. 263 *et sqq.*; Rohault de Fleury, *La Messe*, v., 1-43; Reusens, *Archéologie Chrétienne*, i., pp. 196, 390; Bocquillot, *Traité historique de la Liturgie sacrée*, p. 132 (Paris, 1701, 8vo); Rock, *The Church of our Fathers*, i., p. 250; *Archaeological Journal*, iv., 243; *P.S.A.Sco.*, x., 628; Addis and Arnold, *Roman Catholic Dictionary*, s.v.

A portable altar was generally allowed to missionary priests, *in partibus infidelium*. Corblet, *Histoire du Sacrement du l'Eucharistie*, ii., p. 214.

[6] *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, ix., p. 303, where it is figured.

buried.[1] Grave chalices were also, however, made of lead or brass, and

Silver Massing Chalice, 13th century, formerly at Berwick St. James, Wiltshire, now in the British Museum.[2]

[1] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i., p. 623. In the lists of church goods found in 1297, at the visitation of the churches belonging to the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's Cathedral, there is in almost every instance a *calix stagneus*, as well as a *calix argenteus*. See *Visitations of Churches belonging to St. Paul Cathedral*, pp. 4, 10, 14, 18, 22, 28, 35, 38, 41, 44, 46, 52, 53, 56, 59, 60 (London, 1895, Camden Society). When there was none, it is noted as awanting. At the visitation of 1458 no chalice of pewter or tin is recorded. In the Inventories of Chantries in the county of Somerset of 1545-46 there are many silver, but no pewter chalices. *The Reliquary*, N.S., v. (1891), pp. 208-217.

[2] Reproduced with the sanction of Mr. John Murray, from Cripps' *Old English Plate*, p. 189 (London, 1894).

This chalice, Mr. Cripps points out, has all the points to be observed in those of earliest date, including the slight lip to the bowl which only occurs upon the most ancient of these vessels, quite disappearing before the end of the thirteenth century. The woodcut would do almost equally well for one of the coffin chalices found at Chichester which are of the twelfth century, or that found at York Minster which is of the latter part of the twelfth or first half of the thirteenth century.

even of wax[1] and sometimes of earthenware.[2] Such chalices were cast in one piece, and, not being intended for use, the knop is generally rudimentary in form, and is often, as here, a mere ring.[3]

Pewter Coffin Chalice, 13th century, from Cheam, Surrey.

In later times the practice was abandoned as leading to abuse, and instead a chalice was figured on the tombstone of a priest,[4] and other appropriate emblems on those of other persons.

Great numbers of grave chalices have been found in England.[5] One of pewter of the thirteenth century, found in the stone coffin of a priest at Cheam in Surrey, is figured in the "Surrey Archaeological Collections."[6] The bowl is basin-shaped and more open than the present, but the lip is everted and the knop is replaced by a a projecting ring on the stem. Along with it was a pewter paten. The two objects stood at the left-hand

[1] Wax, however, was not so inexpensive as it now is, and was at one time of considerable value. John V., duke of Brittany, in promising his weight of wax to Notre Dame des Vertus, thought that he was making a handsome gift. Philip of Alsace offered a statue of wax as large as himself to St. Thomas of Canterbury, particularly venerated at the Abbey of Dommartin.

[2] Martene calls it "Samian," and explains that this means fictile ware. "Samos enim est insula ubi primo facta sunt vasa figuli." *De antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus*, Lib. iii., c. 11, tom. ii., p. 368 (Bassani, 1788, fol.). Dr. Milner relates that near the West Gate, at Winchester, adjoining to the parish of St. Valery, there had anciently been a church and cemetery, wherein were found in graves two earthen chalices such as were buried with priests. *History of Winchester*, ii., p. 174; *Archaeological Journal*, iii., p. 139.

[3] *Archaeological Journal*, xliii., p. 140; *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, xix., p. 186 (9th ed.); Reusens, *Elements d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, i., p. 413; ii., p. 347.

[4] Corblet, *Histoire du Sacrement de l'Eucharistie*, ii., p. 242.

[5] *Archaeological Journal*, iii., p. 136; xliii., p. 139; Sussex, *Archaeological Collections*, ix., p. 304; *Journal British Archaeological Association*, v., 165; *P.S.A.*, 2nd S., viii., 207 (Kirkoswald, Cumberland).

[6] Vol. iii. (1865), p. 344. It is also figured in Cripps, *Op. laud.*, p. 188, and the woodcut is borrowed from that work by permission of the publisher. In 1861, a pewter

side of the head of the body. In 1854 a chalice and paten of pewter were found at the left side of a body at Old Sarum.[1] When the church

Pewter Coffin Chalice found at Rhôscrowther, Pembrokeshire.[2]

chalice and paten were found in the churchyard of Charlwood, Surrey. The chalice was crushed, and its precise form could not be ascertained, but it measured about 4½ inches in height, the bowl, which was wide and shallow, measured 4 inches in diameter; the paten 4¾; *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, iii. (1865), p. 346. A similar one was found at Titsey, Surrey, in 1872. *P.S.A.*, 2nd S., vi., 243.

[1] *Archaeologia*, xxxvi., p. 183, where they are figured.

[2] I am indebted to the Society of Antiquaries for the loan of this illustration, reproduced from *P.S.A.*, iii. p. 68.

This vessel differs greatly from the ordinary type of coffin chalice in having a bell-shaped bowl, and a spreading foot with no stem. It is 4 inches high, and the bowl measures 2 inches in diameter. What is its actual date is a very doubtful question.

of the Priory of St. Andrew, Hexham, was restored about fifty years ago, an ancient miniature chalice was found on the breast of a skeleton in a stone coffin lying in the north transept. It was of copper, and had been strongly gilt. It was 2½ inches high, with 2½ inches diameter. The bowl was hemispherical, with a beaded ring round the base. It had a short stem ⅝ of an inch high, and stood upon an inverted segment of a sphere ¾ of an inch high.[1]

Several chalices of pewter were found in 1856 in a cemetery at Abbeville, in the department of the Somme, France. One of them was accompanied by a paten. This chalice weighed 8 hectogrammes (8 oz. avoirdupois) and held 3 decilitres (18 cubic inches). Its height was 7 to 8 centimetres (2¾ to 3 inches). The cup was 4 centimetres (1½ inches) deep and 10 (4 inches) in width.[2] There have been many other finds in France.[3]

There have been comparatively few finds in Scotland. In 1843 a bronze chalice was found in the churchyard of Kingoldrum in Forfarshire.[4] Along with it was a glass bowl,[5] and both were contained in a square bell. The bell has been preserved, and is now in the National Museum. The chalice and bowl, unfortunately, have been lost.

In 1848 a cup or chalice of white wax, 6 inches high, 4 inches across the mouth, and 4½ at the base was found, along with a portion of a

---

[1] Hinds, *History of Northumberland*, iii., Pt. i., p. 175 (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1896, 4to); *Proceedings Newcastle Society of Antiquaries*, iv., p. 278.

[2] Cochet, *Sépultures Gauloises, Romaines, Franques, et Normandes*, p. 384 (Paris, 1857); see also pp. 366, 367.

[3] The foot of another of pewter (*étain*) was found in the grave of a priest at Aubermesnil-les-Érables. *Bulletin de la Commission des Antiquités de la Seine Inférieure*, ii. (1871), p. 153; see also Reusens, *Éléments d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, i., p. 413 (Louvain, 1871), Bapst, *L'Etain*, p. 101 *sqq*.

A number were exhibited at Malines in 1865. Van Drival, *L'Exposition de Malines*, p. 41 (Arras, 1865, 8vo).

[4] *P.S.A.Sco.*, i., p. 20; Wilson, *Prehistoric Annals of Scotland*, ii., p. 474; Anderson, *Scotland in Early Christian Times*, p. 175.

[5] See the case of the Lindores glass vessel, *supra*, p. 221; and Rohault de Fleury, *La Messe*, iv., p, 78.

paten also in wax and a portion of an oaken crozier, in a tomb in Kirkwall Cathedral, supposed to be that of Bishop Tulloch (*circa* 1422-48).[1]

In 1882 a chalice and paten of pewter were found in the churchyard of Bervie, in the county of Kincardine, at the depth of about 4½ to 5 feet from the surface. The chalice had been standing upon the paten with the mouth downwards.[2]

Bishop Tulloch's Chalice.

More recently two brass cups similar to the present were found walled up in a niche in an old house in Musselburgh.[3]

Before concluding these observations upon chalices it may be mentioned that a pewter or tin chalice was, in some cases, directed to be used in connection with the giving of the communion to the sick, but it was for the purpose of enclosing the pyx, not for holding the wine. "When the Eucharist is to be conveyed to the sick near at hand it is to be placed in a pyx, clean and fair, and the pyx itself is to be placed in a pewter chalice (*in calice stanneo*), if there is one, and rolled round with a clean linen cloth.[4] It is to be elevated in procession if the weather permits. When

[1] *P.S.A.Sco.*, v., p. 217. Wilson, *Prehistoric Annals of Scotland*, ii., p. 481. The objects are now in the National Museum, *Catalogue*, p. 295.

[2] *P.S.A.Sco.*, xvii., pp. 330, 371.

[3] *P.S.A.Sco.*, xxviii., p. 217.

[4] The enclosing vessel is also referred to as *pecia*, an equivalent of *calix* or *vas*. Du

the sick person is at a distance the pyx is to be placed in a box (*in capsa*)."[1]

It is not easy to determine the date of the present vessel. It may be of the pre-Reformation period, but has the appearance of sixteenth

Pewter Coffin Chalice found in Bervie Churchyard.

Cange, *Glossarium*, s.v.; *Visitations of Churches belonging to the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's Cathedral*, p. 5 (London, 1895, Camden Society).

[1] Constitution of Bishop David Bernham of St. Andrews, 1242. *Statuta Ecclesiae Scoticanae*, ii., p. 57 (Bannatyne Club); cf. *Concilium Narbonense*, 1609, c. 18, "Dum ministrabunt Eucharistiae sacramentum, illud deferent sacerdotes in pixide, aut intra calicem. Labbe, *Concilia*, xv., p, 1591 (Paris, 1672, fol.). In the Bangor Pontifical the direction in the Office for the communion of the sick is "sacerdos accipiat calicem sine patena et ponat in illo reverenter Corpus Christi, cooperiatque tobalia mundissima." Maskell, *Monumenta ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, i., p. 80. See Reichel, *Manual of Canon Law*, i., p. 127 (London, 1896, 8vo).

Mediaeval English Councils are full of directions with regard to the "box that ys honeste" (John Myrc, *Instructions for Parish Priests*, 1962, E. E. Text Soc.) for the holy Eucharist. Maskell, *Op. laud.*, p. 83. This is the *pixis ad altare*, in which the host is reserved in the tabernacle in the church. But every church had likewise a *pixis ad deferendam Eucharistiam ad infirmos* of wood, ivory, copper, or other metal, with a wallet or bag (*pera*), in which it was enclosed. See *Visitations of Churches belonging to St. Paul's Cathedral*, pp. 11, 18, 22, 26, 29, 30, 35, 39, 41, 45, 47, 49, 52, 56, 58, 62; Corblet, *Essai sur les Ciboires*, p. 68 (Paris, 1858, 8vo); *Histoire du Sacrement de l'Eucharistie*, ii., p. 303.

The *ciborium* was sometimes in the shape of a cup. See Corblet, *Essai, ut supra*, p. 63; *Histoire, ut supra*, p. 302; Gay, *Glossaire archéologique*, s.v. Ciboire.

In the Constitutions of 1220, of Walter Cantilupe, bishop of Worcester, it is directed that the larger churches shall have two chalices of silver, and a third (not consecrated) to be carried to the sick. Wilkins, *Concilia*, i., p. 666. In other statutes the priest is directed to take with him to the sick chamber a silver or pewter vessel (*vas argenteum vel stanneum*), in order that the sick person and the priest may dip their fingers therein after the Eucharist has been communicated. *Statuta Ecclesiae Scoticanae*, ii., p. 34; Wilkins, *Concilia*, i., pp. 579, 657; Bridgett, *History of the Holy Eucharist in Great*

century work, and may be later.[1] The Hunstanton chalice, which is of date 155½, is of somewhat similar form.[2] There is nothing connected with the history of the place of deposit that throws light upon the point.

A chalice was used as one of the symbols of infeftment of an ecclesiastical office, as, for instance, a vicarage[3] or a chaplainry;[4] but the presence of this vessel in Rodil churchyard could scarcely be explained by it having been taken there for the purpose of a notarial infeftment.

ST. CLEMENT'S, RODIL.

Rodil, where the cup was found, is in the south-east of the Island of Harris. "Within the south pairt of this ile," says Archdeacon Monro, writing in 1549, "lyes ane monastery with a steipell, quhilk was foundit and biggit be M'Cloyd of Harrey, callit Roodill".[5] It is entered by John Spotiswood in his "Account of all the Religious Houses that were in Scotland at the time of the Reformation" as a monastery of the Canon-

---

Britain, ii., p. 69; Maskell, *Monumenta ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, i., p. cclxxix.; Müller, *Ornatus Ecclesiasticus* (Munich, 1591), quoted in *Visitations of Churches belonging to St. Paul's Cathedral*, p. xlviii.

[1] The shape is that of post-Reformation chalices of the middle of the 16th century. See Trollope, *Church Plate of Leicestershire*, plates v., xi., xv., xix. (London, 1890, 4to, 2 vols.). The tendency of the grave chalice was to retain earlier forms. Rohault de Fleury, *La Messe*, iv., p. 143. The bowl of the ordinary mass chalice is much flatter than that of the Rodil vessel, wider and shallower. In the most ancient form of chalice the bowl was, however, tall and narrow, much resembling the Rodil Cup, except that it had a straight, not everted lip. One is figured, Reusens, *Archéologie Chrétienne*, i., p. 216 (Louvain, 1871-75, 8vo).

[2] Compare Swinefield, post-Reformation, 156¾; *P.S.A.*, 2nd S., viii., 465.

[3] See for example, *Diocesan Registers of Glasgow*, ii., pp. 113, 202.; *Registrum Monasterii de Cambuskenneth*, pp. 189, 211 (Edinb., 1872, 4to).

[4] "And than incontinent, in presens of the paraschyn, Gylbert Wilyamson, balye as the said awter, with buk and chaliis gaf possession and charge to Sir Lorans to do seruis and messis saying," *Records of the Burgh of Peebles*, p. 175, 3 March, 1475 (Burgh Records Society); cf. *Ib.*, pp. 182, 185, 187, 190, 250.

Symeon, of Durham, mentioning a Benefaction to the See of Earl Copsi, adds, "In cujus donationis signum etiam scyphum argenteum obtulit, qui in hac ecclesia servatus aeternam illius facti retinet memoriam." Symeonis Monachi, *Opera*, i., p. 97 (Roll's series).

[5] *The Description of the Western Isles of Scotland, called Hybrides*, in *Miscellanea Scotica*, ii., p. 150 (Glasgow, 1818).

The relics of St. Clement were transported to Rome in the ninth century by SS. Cyril and Methodius and deposited in the basilica of San Clemente, one of the most ancient churches in the world.[1] When the Emperor, Lewis II., in 872 endowed the great Benedictine Abbey of Cava, near Salerno, Pope Adrian II. presented[2] to it the greater part of these relics.[3]

The *Natalitia Clementis*, that is the day of commemoration of his martyrdom, has been placed in the Roman Martyrology on 23rd November, and was roughly taken in the Ancient Church calendar as the beginning of winter:—

> Dat Clemens hyemem, dat Petrus ver cathedratus
> Aestuat Urbanus, autumnat Bartholomaeus.[4]

St. Clement's most usual symbol is an anchor, which is used to mark his day on the Runic calendars.[5] The device of the parish of St. Clement Danes is an anchor, which the beadles and other officials bear on their buttons, and which also somewhat incongruously surmounts the weather-cock on the steeple.[6]

There are forty-seven churches dedicated to St. Clement in England. In Scotland there were only a few.

Dictionnaire des legendes du Christianisme, p. 299, *s.v.* Saint Clément. See also the *Menologium Graecum*, i., p. 210.

Another version of the English version will be found in Dr. Horstmann's *Early South-English Legendary*, p. 322 (E. E. Text Society). The story is reproduced as an historical fact by Father Mullooly, *Saint Clement Pope and Martyr*, p. 86 (Rome, 1869, 8vo).

[1] Mullooly, *Op. laud.*, p. 95 *sqq.*

[2] There was a passion at this time for the possession of relics and remains of all sorts, bodies and bones were sent from Rome all over Christendom. Gregorovius, *History of Rome in the Middle Ages*, iii., p. 72 (London, 1895, translated by Miss Hamilton).

[3] Mabillon, *Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti*, tom. iii., pp. 132, 179, 186 (Lut. Paris, 1706, fol.); *Chronicon Casauriense* in Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, ii., Pt. ii., p. 781.

[4] The Festival of the Chair of St. Peter at Antioch, the Chairing of St. Peter as it is styled in the *Golden Legend*, which used to mark the commencement of spring, is 22nd February. The feast of St. Urban, taken as the opening of summer, is 25th May. St. Bartholomew's day is 24th August.

[5] *Archaeologia*, xli., p. 469: Cahier, *Caractéristiques des Saints*, i., p. 166 (Paris, 1867, 4to).

[6] Jameson, *Sacred and Legendary Art*, ii., p. 628 (London, 1857, 8vo).

St. Clement protected against the illnesses of children.[1] He was the patron saint of hatters,[2] tanners, and bakers,[3] and also of boatmen, ferrymen,[4] and fishermen, and it was probably in this character that he is found at Rodil.

---

[1] Cahier, *Caractéristiques des Saints*, ii., p. 610 (Paris, 1867, 4to).

[2] Husenbeth, *Emblems of Saints*, p. 356 (3rd ed. Norwich, 1882).

[3] Brand, *Popular Antiquities*, i., pp. 360, 361 (London, 1873, 8vo).

[4] Cahier, *Op. laud.*, ii., Pt. ii., p. 610; Mueller und Mothes, *Archaeologisches Wörterbuch*, s.v. Clement (Leipzig, 1877).

No. VII.

ANNUAL EXCURSIONS OF THE SOCIETY

FOR 1895 AND 1896.

1895.

THE Excursion took place on Tuesday, 3rd September, the day's programme including Carlisle, Lanercost Priory, Naworth Castle, and the Roman Station of Birdoswald (Amboglanna) and other portions of the Wall of Hadrian. Over twenty members, most of whom went to Carlisle on the previous evening, were present. Among these were John Honeyman, R.S.A., F.R.I.B.A., Ex-President, George Neilson, F.S.A.Scot., Peter Sturrock of Baltersan, late M.P. for the Kilmarnock Burghs, J. Dalrymple Duncan, F.S.A. Lond. & Scot., Hon. Secretary, Wm. George Black, F.S.A.Scot., Hon. Secretary, John Edwards, F.S.A.Scot., William Anderson, F.S.A.Scot., James A. Duncan, Walter Easton, Thomas Whitelaw, T. L. Galbraith, G. R. Roxburgh, etc.

The starting-point and base of operations was the border capital, so long famous as the frontier stronghold of England, whether for defence or for aggression, against the Scots. Municipally it has a long history, the Luguballia of the Romans becoming the Caer Luel of the post-Roman Britons, and the Carleol or Carlisle of Anglo-Saxons, Danes, Normans, and Englishmen for the last thousand years and more. Its effective establishment as an English borough it owed to King William Rufus, and its acquisition of, and struggles to maintain, civic chartered liberties, form an important chapter in the annals of English burghal progress, well warranting the claim of Carlisle to be styled a Royal City. Its external history not less thoroughly vouches its right to be reckoned *par excellence* "the Border City." The life of sturt and strife deemed typical of the

Marches was emphatically the life of Carlisle until the Union of the Crowns. For its annals it has had the good fortune to find able scholars among its sons. Bishop Creighton has sympathetically sketched its story in a volume of the "Historic Towns Series," and Chancellor R. S. Ferguson, indefatigable in his attention to its local archæology, has done much to give more than local value to its antiquities. The Society was fortunate on Tuesday morning in having the kind aid and guidance of the latter through the Tullie House Museum and round the Castle. The Museum is rich in local relics of all kinds, but its chief importance to antiquaries consists in the numerous altars, utensils, and ornaments which have been found in the City—many of them from the foundations of Tullie House itself—and which attest the highly developed character of the Roman settlement. The Castle, with its gatehouse, outer and inner wards, and tall keep, doubtless occupies the site of a pre-Roman as well as post-Roman fort. As a mediæval building, including the keep, its construction has on the strength of a passage in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, been usually[1] attributed to William Rufus, in the year 1092. Although from a Scottish point of view, the Castle has more memories of interest than the Cathedral, the latter presents architecturally far more features of attraction and importance. When, leaving the Castle, the Society proceeded to the Cathedral, Chancellor Ferguson committed the party to the guidance of his no less accomplished brother, Mr. C. J. Ferguson, architect, whose unique study of, and long familiarity with the edifice, enabled him to impart a high degree of interest to his account of it. He traced the record of the structure in its existing parts—the massive early Norman work in the two eastern bays of the nave and in the south transept, the early English work in the outside walls of the north and south aisles of the choir, and the later fourteenth and fifteenth century work in the body of the choir and the tower. The noble east window with its elegantly flowing tracery and its fragments of the oldest glass, the curious

[1] See, however, *Notes and Queries*, 26th October, 1895, for a paper on "The Keep of Carlisle," suggested by the visit of the Society now under description, wherein record evidences of the most definite character are adduced to show that although in 1092 Rufus may have erected some portion of the *enceinte* or outer walls, the keep itself was built about the year 1139, by David I. of Scotland, then resident in Carlisle.

and beautiful sculptures on the capitals of the choir pillars, the brass of Bishop Richard Bell, the finely-carved tabernacle work of the stalls, and the rude monkish paintings with explanatory legends attached, were all briefly but lucidly described.

At 12.15 the excursionists were joined by a number of visitors who had come from Glasgow by the 10 o'clock train. They proceeded by rail to Gilsland, where they were met by the Rev. A. H. Wright. They visited first a portion of the Roman Wall, showing from three to four feet in height still standing, in the grounds of the Vicarage; also a curious mound of doubtful purpose on the line of the rampart. Then taking carriages they drove to Birdoswald, the famous Roman Station of Amboglanna. The walls, gates, and chambers, and the interior of the buildings were all examined, and the altars were shown and explained by Mr. Wright, and by Professor Pelham of Oxford, who had been residing in that district, and had superintended the making of several important excavations in the neighbourhood. The journey was then resumed along the line of the Roman Wall, the party having their attention directed at many points to the characteristics of the *murus* and the *vallum*. When they arrived at the Priory of Lanercost, beautifully situated in the wooded valley of the Irthing, the Rev. H. Whitehead, the enthusiastic and scholarly incumbent of that very interesting church, guided the party through it, indicating his opinion that it had originally been an aisleless church of the early Norman type, built towards the end of the twelfth century, but subsequently enlarged into a single aisle building which remained little altered during the greater part of its effective existence as a priory. The final stage of the excursion was the brief passage from Lanercost to Naworth Castle, the home of the Dacres and the Howards, and the centre of innumerable Border martial memories. It is now the residence of the representative of the Howards, the Earl of Carlisle, who met the party with exceeding hospitality and courtesy, conducting them through the mansion, which, with a library in every other room, with tapestries, miniatures, pictures and heraldic figures, forms one long vista of antiquarian and artistic charm. The armour of "Belted Will" hangs in the hall, and his Lordship remarked that he had been unable to find any earlier authority than Sir Walter Scott for the

use of that epithet. The company then drove from Naworth to Naworth Station, and took the train to Carlisle Station, where they dined in the Central Hotel. Mr. Honeyman occupied the chair, supported on his right and left by Chancellor Ferguson, F.S.A., Mr. C. J. Ferguson, F.S.A., the Rev. A. H. Wright, and the Rev. H. Whitehead. At various points in the journey the party gave grateful expression of their thanks to the local gentlemen who had acted as guides, and had made the excursion as pleasant as it was archæologically instructive.

1896.

THE Excursion took place on Friday, 4th September, when a visit was paid to the Island of Bute. About thirty of the members were present, among whom were: John Honeyman, R.S.A., F.R.I.B.A., Ex-President, George Neilson, F.S.A.Scot., James Caldwell, F.S.A.Scot., Colonel Menzies, John Edwards, F.S.A.Scot., J. Dalrymple Duncan, F.S.A.Lond. & Scot., Hon. Secretary, P. MacGregor Chalmers, F.S.A.Scot., Walter Easton, D. S. Miller, James T. Bell, James A. Duncan, J. W. Ruddock, James Maclay, John Mann, C.A., Councillor Sorley, James Provan of Auchingillan, William Gibson, T. B. Fotheringham, John Aitken, W. Anderson Baillie, etc.

Leaving the Central Station at 8.45, the party crossed from Gourock by the "Lord of the Isles." On arriving at Rothesay, they were met by the Rev. J. King Hewison, F.S.A.Scot., author of *Bute in the Olden Time*, under whose efficient guidance a very pleasant day was spent in examining the various objects of antiquarian interest the island contains. Driving through Ascog and the grounds of Mountstuart, the first halt was made at the Standing Stones of Langalchorad, near Kingarth Manse. The circle originally consisted of nine stones, and must have been about 86 feet in diameter. Only three of the stones remain, one being conglomerate, the others whin. The peculiar shape of the first of these suggested the theory thrown out by Mr. Honeyman, that it had at one time been formed into a cross, though it is now so much weathered that it is impossible to form any very definite opinion in regard to this. The members next proceeded to Dunagoil, a picturesque headland crowned by the remains of a fort, part

of the defences of which consist of a vitrified wall. This wall runs to about 285 feet in length, and is 6 feet thick. As it at present exists the vitrifaction would seem to have been applied from the outer face, extending inwards to the depth of 5 feet 6 inches. Behind this, the remaining portion of the wall, 3 feet 6 inches broad, is unvitrified. As, however, the generally-accepted theory with regard to such structures is that the heat was applied from above, this would point to there having formerly been a similar unvitrified portion of wall on the seaward side, though this has disappeared.

From Dunagoil the party went on to the ruined church of St. Blane, which stands on an elevated site about three miles south from the present Parish Church of Kingarth. It consists of an oblong nave 50 feet 6 inches in length internally, and a choir 26 feet 3 inches long, separated by a fine chancel arch of Norman design. Much interest was excited by the peculiar character of portions of the masonry of the choir. For 13 feet east of the chancel arch the walls consist of fine square-dressed ashlar work similar to the Norman masonry of the nave, but beyond this they are constructed in their lower portions of whinstone rubble work, with square dressed freestone of an inferior character above. Mr. Galloway's theory in regard to this was that the whinstone work was part of a very ancient and holy religious edifice, and that the Norman work was built around it to preserve these venerable remains. It seems, however, more probable that the whole choir was formerly Norman throughout, and that by some accident the eastern portion fell into a ruinous condition, and was rebuilt in an inferior style. In the east wall are two single-light windows under which is an aumbry. There is a similar window in the north wall of the choir, and a corresponding opening formerly existed in the south wall, but a two-light window has been substituted for the latter at a higher level, leaving the sill of its predecessor *in situ*. Towards the east end of the south wall is a piscina. The Society noticed with much satisfaction the steps which are being taken by the Marquess of Bute to preserve the remains of St. Blane's. The walls were rapidly crumbling away, but operations are now in progress by which this unfortunate condition of affairs will be effectually arrested. Interesting excavations are

also being made by Lord Bute on the site of part of the domestic buildings formerly occupied by the monastic community, and on which latterly stood the manse of the ministers of Kingarth. These excavations have resulted in laying bare the foundations of various buildings, evidently early in date, and very curious in their architectural arrangements. Further light will probably be thrown on their character as the work proceeds. It may be also mentioned that the foundations of the great wall which surrounded the conventual precincts have been discovered and exposed. All who are interested in early Scottish ecclesiology must view with satisfaction the admirable work at present being carried on by Lord Bute at St. Blane's.

Returning to Rothesay *via* Loch Fad a visit was paid to the Parish Church, where the shaft of the Celtic cross standing in the churchyard was inspected—its most remarkable feature being the existence of a tenon at the upper end, indicating that the cross had been jointed on. The monuments in the ruined chapel of St. Mary were examined, but in view of the limited time at the disposal of the members it was found impossible to enter upon the consideration of the disputed points in regard to their date and the persons they are supposed to commemorate.

Rothesay Castle was next visited. It is one of the earliest of the Scots castles, and its origin is involved in obscurity. The original portion of the fortress consists of a circular or oval wall of enceinte defended by four round towers. The diameter of the courtyard is 142 feet. On the north side is a barbican or forework probably added in the latter portion of the 14th century. The buildings are surrounded by a moat. Rothesay Castle was a favourite residence of Robert II. and Robert III. It was destroyed by the Earl of Argyle in 1685.

The members thereafter dined in the Royal Hotel. Mr. Honeyman presided, and among the guests were Provost Milloy, Mr. Windsor Stuart, Commissioner to the Marquess of Bute, ex-Provost Mackirdy, the Rev. Mr. Hewison, and the Rev. Mr. Saunders of Kingarth.



Old English ..... Name disused before 1300.
Ordinary ..... Name 1200 - 1400.
Italic ..... Name 1400 - 1600.
(Italic in Brackets) Name not in records till modern tim
Roman Wall and Vellum.
Wall only.
Marsh or Merse Lands.
Areas of known change in outline

Outlines as in Ordnance Survey and Admiralty Charts

I. General Sketch Map.

No. VII.

ANNALS OF THE SOLWAY—UNTIL A.D. 1307.

BY

GEORGE NEILSON, F.S.A. Scot.

[*Read at a Meeting of the Society held on 13th November*, 1896.]

I. FROM AGRICOLA TO ST. CUTHBERT.

1. The Roman Advance.

Until the thirteenth century there is scant record of the great estuary which, dividing Dumfriesshire and Galloway from Cumberland, was so well fitted by nature to form part of an international frontier line. Of pre-Roman times there is, of course, no human record at all except in the canoes occasionally found in the great mosses[1] which hem in the east end of the firth, and occupy ground once covered by the sea.

> "Once a wood and once a sea,
> Now it's a moss, and aye shall be,"

is the local rhyme of Lochar Moss.[2]

The Roman record is filled with uncertainties. The geography of

[1] Lochar Moss, Priestside Moss or Flow, Solway (anciently Salom) Moss, Rockcliffe Moss, Drumburgh (anciently Drumbou) Moss, Glasson Moss, Bowness Flow.

[2] The *New Statistical Account* (Dumfriesshire, p. 41) of Tinwald parish in all apparent good faith sets it down that a place on the Lochar, eight miles inland, was said to be marked upon an old Dutch chart as "the safest and most commodious harbour for shipping in Scotland"!! But of course the marine memories of Lochar Moss belong to a geological period a few millenniums before Dutch navigation began!

Agricola's campaigns, as described by Tacitus,[1] is too confused to admit of definite conclusions regarding the estuary—*usque ad Tanaum* (*aestuario nomen est*)—which he reached in A.D. 80, and which some commentators[2] have believed to be not the Tay, as generally assumed, but the Solway. There is a consensus of learned opinion, however, that Ptolemy,[3] in his mention, nearly a century later than Tacitus, of the estuary of the Itouna, of the outlet of the Novius, and of the outlet of the Deva, alluded to the Eden, the Nith, and the Dee, all rivers flowing into what we now denominate as the Firth of Solway. The consonance between the estuary of Tana and the estuary of Itouna has not hitherto attracted much attention, but may be commended to the students of the Roman occupation. There is no evidence that the Romans gave the name in question to the entire arm of the sea. Itouna, if synonymous with Eden, was evidently a name confined to the upper end of the Solway, as, indeed, the term "estuary of the Eden" is to this day. The precise original meaning of Solway is a matter for future examination: it is enough meantime to note that the word was unknown to the Romans.

With the firth itself they were perforce made familiar. Their northward march lay through the territories of the great tribe of the Brigantes, a turbulent race in possession of Cumberland and the whole north of England. When Agricola reached the Solway he found that on the other side of it there dwelt the Selgovae, occupants of Dumfriesshire and Galloway. They were probably akin to the Brigantes in blood and religion, as well as in their warlike proclivities.

The geography of Agricola's Caledonian campaigns is too indistinct to dogmatize upon, and one cannot follow our great antiquary, George Chalmers, in his conclusions[4] that Agricola sailed up the firth, landed at the mouth of the Lochar, marched up the Nith for some distance, and

---

[1] *Agricola*, ch. 22. The later editions read *Tanaum* in place of the former *Taum*, editors stating that *Tanaum* is the correct reading of the MSS.

[2] Chalmers's *Caledonia*, book i., ch. 3.

[3] *Geographia*, lib. ii., ch. 2, in *Monumenta Britannica*, excerpta, p. xii.

[4] *Caledonia*, i., ch. 3, p. 105.

then crossed into Galloway. It was, however, Tacitus assures us, only by many battles that Agricola "subdued that part of Britain which looks over at Ireland."

2. Under Rome.

When Rome fairly settled herself in Britain, and her frontier system came to be adjusted, the firth formed such an outstanding natural line that it beyond a doubt formed the dominating consideration in determining the direction and place of the great barrier thrown across the island from sea to sea. Opinion is still far from settled with regard to the date and even the purpose of the Vallum and the Murus, which extended from Bowness on Solway to Wallsend on Tyne. The view of Dr. Collingwood Bruce, that the entire works are of one date and one purpose, has practically left the field, and the modern tendency appears to be setting towards the belief that the Vallum, an earthwork consisting of a fosse with a rampart on each side of it, and a marginal mound for long distances on the south side in addition, was antecedent to the Murus, the latter being a stone and lime wall with a fosse in front of it. All questions of date are vague. Probably the original Vallum, a *limes* or boundary,[1] with a defensive object subordinated, was thrown up in the time of Hadrian, followed later, though perhaps not much later, by the Murus, a powerful fortified line. Camden[2] had sound Roman authority behind him when he said that the Wall was put up to keep out the "Barbarians, who in those parts were continually barking and snarling at the Roman Empire." The western extremity of the Vallum was at Dykesfield, near Burgh by Sands; that of the Wall was further west at Bowness. The meaning of this great work may be taken to be that, when it was planned, the Romans had decided if not to leave the region north of it to the Picts, at all events to concentrate their efforts upon strengthening their defences so as to secure themselves in the territory to the south. When Roman conquest held,

---

[1] Professor Pelham and Mr. F. Haverfield have developed the *limes* argument with great cogency, although they have not yet satisfied us all of the absence of a design of defence.

[2] *Britannia* (ed. Gibson, 1695), p. 830; see also p. 837 *et seq.*

or aimed at holding, Caledonian territory beyond, the Solway is thought to have formed part of the dividing line[1] between the provinces of Valentia on the north and Maxima Caesariensis on the south of the Wall.

3. After Rome.

By the departure of the Romans in the fifth century the Romanized Britons were left to guard themselves as best they might behind the splendid rampart which the Romans had built. But no sooner were the Romans gone than, as Gildas,[2] the Jeremiah of British chronicle, tells with indignant eloquence: "Foul hordes of Picts and Scots, like tawny worms coming forth in the burning heat of noon out of the deepest recesses of their holes, hastily land from their curraghs in which they had crossed the Tithican Valley;[3] differing in manners, but all sharing the same thirst for blood, and more eager to shroud their villainous faces with beards than to cover with decent clothing those parts of their bodies which required it." These bearded men with kilts, who sailed up the Solway, soon effaced the Roman Wall as a boundary, and in the chaos of the ensuing four or five hundred years it cannot be said that even the estuary remained a constant division mark of race or realm. There were Picts in Galloway and Britons in Cumbria or Strathclyde, the latter a province stretching north to Dumbarton, and south into Lancashire, if not right down into Wales. In the sixth century comes the news of the first great battle[4] fought in the vicinity. At Arthuret on the Esk, in the year 573, Rhydderch of Cumbria, a Christian, overcame the pagan Guendoleu. St. Ninian, supposed to have been a native of the district, raised that first of all stone churches in Scotland, worthier of venera-

---

[1] *Notitia*, cap. 68; Ammianus Marcellinus, lib. xxviii., cap. 3; *Monumenta Britannica*, excerpta, pp. xxiii., lxxiv.

[2] *Historia Gildae*, cap. 15; *Monumenta Britannica*, p. 11.

[3] This expression has been considerably discussed. Most probably it is an inflated term from classic Tethys, wife of the ocean, a goddess whose name was a metonym for the sea. The "Tethican Valley" thus points to the Solway Strath.

[4] *Chron. of Picts and Scots*, xciii., cliv. 161; Skene's *Celtic Scot*, i. 157; Skene's *Ancient Books of Wales*, i. 368.

tion than Iona itself, that little white building, of which there is good reason to hope[1] some portions yet remain. It stood on the shore of what one copyist of Gildas called "the Sea of Galloway."[2] St. Mungo, whose first seat in Scotland as bishop was at Hoddom in Annandale, followed in sowing the seeds of Christianity on the Solway shore. Already when he came there was a great admixture of races amongst the inhabitants—Picts and Britons having now the Angles in the very midst of their territory. The number of dedications of churches in Galloway, Dumfriesshire, and Cumberland to St. Mungo[3] and St. Cuthbert, equally with the historical connection of these saints with the whole district, and the probable community of Celtic feeling pervading it, shows that the religious conquest of those regions had been accomplished about the same time and by the same instrumentality. St. Mungo's diocese of Glasgow was co-extensive with the province of Cumbria.

II. GEOGRAPHICAL: THE ORIGINAL SOLWAY.

4. Solway and Selgovae.

In spite of repeated alterations of the international boundary line, now at the estuary itself, now north of it, now south, it is not till the thirteenth century that the name of Solway comes distinctly forward. Thenceforth it has an enduring place in international history, vouched by many references in chronicle, border law, and charters. It is becoming that in the light of these documents we should search out the origin of the name. It may surprise some to learn that one of the first matters for consideration is whether the Solway proper was an arm of the sea.

Three hundred years ago Camden said[4] in his *Britannia* that the estuary "is called by both nations Solway Frith, from Solway, a town of the Scots that stands upon it." At another place in his great work he informs us

---

[1] See P. Macgregor Chalmers's *St. Ninian's Candida Casa.*

[2] *Monumenta Britannica*, 5.

[3] *St. Ninian and St. Kentigern* (*Historians of Scotland*), pp. lxxxii.-xc.

[4] *Britannia*, 830.

that the village of Solway stands near the mouth of the Nith.[1] I ha looked very diligently for traces of this village of Solway on the Ni but after a careful examination of maps, books, and charters, I can fi no such village except in Camden's book and his map of Scotland, the maps of Scotland according to Mercator and Ortelius[2] (where perha Camden obtained his information), and on John Speed's map,[3] whi if I mistake not, like Camden's, follows Mercator and Ortelius. Camd and all the map-makers were wrong; there never was a village called Solw on the Nith at all.

English antiquaries, from the venerable Beda downwards, have w varying degrees of zeal, sanity, and success dabbled in the philology place-names. Camden, no exception to the rule, proceeds to specula on the source of the word Solway, which, he concludes, "still reta somewhat of the old name of Selgovae." The view is endorsed Christopher Irvine in his curious work on Scottish Historical Nomenclatu published in 1682, wherein he says[5] the *Solvæus* or Solway Firth "ha its denomination from the old people Selgovi." The proposition thus fi enunciated by Camden that the name of this ancient race had clung the firth on the shores of which they dwelt, and was thus a survival attesti their existence in these parts, was implicitly accepted by many subseque writers. Indeed it passed for a time as an axiom with authorities place-names.[6] Nevertheless, the word has nothing whatever to do w the Selgovae.

---

[1] *Britannia*, 907.

[2] Mercator's *Geographia*, Tabula I. Scotiae: Ortelius, *Theatrum Orbis*, Scotiae Tab

[3] Speed's *Theatre of Britain*, Map of Scotland, date 1611. [4] *Britannia*, 90

[5] *Historiae Scoticae Nomenclatura Latino-vernacula*, 1682, *voce* Solvæus.

[6] Isaac Taylor, *Words and Places*, 1882, p. 49; Rhys's *Celtic Britain*, 218. C Taylor, most helpful of writers on place-names, has now somewhat revised his fo opinion, though I cannot help regarding him as still in error. In his *Names and Histories* (1896) he countenances Dr. Guest's suggestion of a Celtic source for *Sul* below, note to ch. 6), and hesitates between explaining Solway as a "tidal channel, as a "tidal ford." The Rev. James B. Johnston had before this been drawing near mark as regards the first syllable in his very serviceable *Place-Names of Scotland*, 1

5. The Thirteenth Century Solway.

When the name first occurs in thirteenth century documents, it is almost invariably mentioned with the preposition "at" prefixed. Only by straining the natural sense of that expression can it be forced into keeping with the idea of the Solway being regarded as the name of an estuary or a river. We say "at Annan," because we mean the place and not the river: we do not say "at Nith." Neither could thirteenth century clerks have written "at Solway" without meaning something very definite and very different from "at the Solway Firth." Many meetings took place *apud Sulewath*, at Solway. Thus Reginald, King of the Isles, was to be met[1] in 1218 "at Sulewad." The Statute of Marches[2] in 1249 enacts that the proper tribunal for the trial of offences against the border laws was "at Sulewath," or, as another manuscript has it, "at Sulway." There was an appeal,[3] in 1280, concerning one of these trials "at Solewathe." Finally, in legal proceedings of date 1292, there is descriptive mention,[4] as the peculiar West March place of justice, of "a certain place called Sulwat at the marches of the realms." The march laws[5] of 1249 point to a closer localization of the spot, for they refer to the driving of cattle across the river Esk as an incident of the trial in certain cases of disputed ownership. About 1275 it is mentioned in a connection[6] which places it clearly on the most direct line of road into Scotland from the south. In the accounts[7] of the campaign of Edward I., in 1300, it is mentioned as the ford at Sulwath, *transitus apud Sulwath*. The

---

p. 223, proposing "Old Norse *Söl-vagr*, muddy bay." Evidently none of the authors had seen my *Trial by Combat*, 1890, p. 127, where my solution was put on record. Close history is necessary to true etymology.

[1] Bain's *Cal.* i. 696.

[2] *Acts Parl. Scot.* i. 414: "Sulewat."

[3] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 183.

[4] Stevenson's *Hist. Doc. Scot.* i. 357, "ad quemdam locum qui vocatur Sulwat ad divisas regnorum."

[5] *Acts Parl. Scot.* i. 416.

[6] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 64, compared with iii. 716. See ch. 13 below.

[7] *Liber Quotidianus Garderobae*, 129.

evidence of the thirteenth century, therefore, sets forth a number of propositions which the course of subsequent history amply confirms. These are:

1. That Sulewad, Sulwath, or Solway, interpreted by the earliest allusions to it, did not denote an arm of the sea, did not indeed denote even a river, but was a distinctly limited *locus*, a point or place[1] upon a river.

2. That it was a meeting-place for the administration of border law.

3. That it was a place where the English escort might meet a royal visitor passing into England.

4. That it was on the marches of the realms.

5. That it was on the river Esk.

6. That it was already recognized as a regular crossing place.

These facts lead to an induction as little open to question as themselves, namely, that the original Solway was a ford across the mouth of the Esk.

6. Etymological and Historical Details.

When the assistance of fourteenth century records is invoked it is demonstrable that there were three leading fords — one from Annan to Bowness, still known as the Annan or Bowness Wath, and styled *vadum Anandiae* by the chronicler Knighton;[2] another opposite Dornock, known as the Dornock Wath, but more anciently as the Sandywathe;[3] and the third and chief of them all, at Eskmouth, known as the Solewath, Sulewad, or Sulwath, a word which easily explains itself. *Sol* is a term, common to Anglo-Saxon and to the Norse languages, for mud. Anglo-Saxon *wæth*—Norse *vad* or *vath*, a frequent suffix in Icelandic local names—is a word for ford. Sulewad or Sulwath means therefore the muddy ford.[4]

---

[1] Compare a parallel case from a Wetheral charter of lands on the Eden, incidentally mentioning "locum qui dicitur Munkwath" (*Monasticon*, iii. 598).

[2] Under year 1335.

[3] *Lanercost Chronicle*, 272. See my paper on "Battle of Dornock," in *Transactions Dumfries and Galloway Antiq. Society*, 1895-96, p. 154.

[4] That the first syllable *Sol* or *Sul* cannot, as Dr. Guest proposed, be Celtic *sul*, a hypothetical word for sea or tide, is to be inferred with some positiveness on three



II. FROM MAP OF DEBATABLE LAND. 1552.

There is nothing remarkable in an arm of the sea being called after a ford across it. Wath is a well-known word in Cumberland and on the border. In East England it takes the form of Wash.[1] The large tidal estuary of The Wash, formerly known as The Washes, possibly owes its title to its many fords, in one of which King John's army was surprised, and his treasure swept away. A ford was apt to thrust itself far more upon the attention of the early inhabitants, was often of more use to some of them than the estuary, and so at times acquired a specific name the sooner. And the proposition that one ford might baptise a whole estuary is curiously exemplified more recently by the Solway itself, for local topographers of last century regarded "Booness Wath" as simply another name for the firth.[2]

The story of the Solway for several centuries will ever and again illustrate the importance of its once famous original ford, but before attempting to set forth the annals in a chronological sequence it is necessary to adduce further evidence on geography.

Throughout the fourteenth century, despite many allusions to the Solway (usually as Sulwath or in a closely allied spelling), there is comparatively little in the references to point decisively to its exact site. There is a singularly instructive map,[3] made in the fourteenth century, in which the

---

grounds: 1. Nobody will now dispute that *wath*, the second syllable, is English, not Celtic. 2. There is a too often forgotten law of place-name grammar—the strong presumption against hybrids. Celtic descriptive words seldom combine with English suffixes unless they have previously passed into use as terms understood by English-speaking people. 3. The argument from local contrast and analogy is still stronger. In the vicinity of the old Sulwath are (see general map, No. 1.) Stonywath, Sandywath, and Blawath, to which may be added Loanwath (near the mouth of the Sark, *Dumfries Retours*, 216)—all intelligible as compounds entirely English.

[1] *Words and Places* (1882), p. 331.

[2] *Old Statistical Account* (Dornock), ii. 15. Booness, of course, is Bowness.

[3] See map No. 3, from *National MSS. Scot.*, part iii., No. 2. This use of the plural *vada* is interesting, and stands practically alone. In the few examples existing of any similar epithet, I remember noticing no other that was not in the singular, like *transitus* (*Lib. Quot. Gard.* 129); *passagium* (*Rot. Scotiae*, ii. 166).

words *Vada de Sulway* are marked across the river Esk. Fordun[1] wrote of "the Esk, which is called Scottiswath or Sulwath." These comments each serve a purpose vaguely. A document of the year 1307 is much more definite, and in an important sense supplementary to the evidences already grouped. It is a petition[2] to Edward II. by a person desirous to farm the toll "between Soulwadz and Arturet." This toll, it is fair to conclude, was that levied from passengers into England. Of this exaction there is conclusive proof some years later.[3] The two localities named are determinate. Arthuret is obviously, in the mind of the petitioner, not more a fixed point than Solway. Both must be on the Esk, and Solway cannot be far from its mouth.

7. The Lochmabenstane.

The character of Solway as a border meeting-point is seen to be maintained in the fourteenth century by the record of prisoners being ransomed, and of a kind of market being held there,[4] a constant characteristic of such assemblies. There are, unfortunately, no documents on the administration of March law on the western border until 1398, when the first of a long series of allusions is made[5] to the Clochmabanestane, afterwards oftener styled Lochmabenstane, as the specific forum for the West March. From 1398 onward the Lochmabenstane plays a large part in border litigation and negotiation. The Warden courts were held there, and generally it may be said that exactly the functions of that sort assigned to the Sulwath in the end of the thirteenth century have, at the end of the fourteenth century, come to belong to the Lochmabenstane.

The position and characteristics of that old stone, therefore, call for close examination. It still stands[6] a few yards above high-water-mark on

---

[1] "Flumen Esk quod dicitur Scotiswath sive Sulwath" (Fordun, i. cap. 2); "Esk, sed alias dicitur Scotiswath" (Fordun, iii. cap. 7); "Trans aquam de Sulwath" (Fordun, *Annals*, cap. 34).

[2] Bain's *Cal.* iii. 31.

[3] *Rotuli Scotiae*, i. 658.

[4] Bain's *Cal.* iii. 675 (2 and 7).

[5] *Foedera*: 6th November, 1398; Bain, iv. 512.

[6] Mr. Bruce Armstrong has given a good sketch of it in his *Liddesdale*, p. 154.

the sea shore, in Gretna parish, a lonely granitic boulder some six feet or so in height, and nine or ten in circumference. It is close to the junction of the Sark and Kirtle with the Esk. Geographically, functionally, and historically it answers at the end of the fourteenth century closely to the characteristics of the "place called Sulwat, at the marches of the realms," a hundred years before. Hence the belief that this is no chance coincidence, but that in very truth the Lochmabenstane marks the Scottish terminus of the great historic ford.

This conclusion, if well founded, must add a new interest to that old grey stone. Dropped from some iceberg in an earlier geological period, it lay, when the land emerged from the sea, an unheeded block until the barbaric piety of some ancient race installed it as the presiding stone of an oval group—the chief stone of the cluster,[1] as its original Celtic name of Clochmaban possibly means. Or it may mark the grave or be otherwise associated with Maponus,[2] a heathen deity equated with Apollo, worshipped in Cumberland and Northumberland during the Roman occupation: or with the memory of Mabon,[3] that vague Arthurian heroic adumbration. Whatever its original connotation,[4] we can see that in after centuries the solemnity inherited from a forgotten purpose clung to it like the mossy verdure around its base, and it became a fit adjunct of the courts of border justice and the transaction of grave international business. And if the while, besides all this, it pointed out the great track across the

---

[1] *Cloch*, a stone; *Maibean*, a bunch or cluster (Highland Soc. *Gaelic Dictionary*, 1827). The group, of which the Lochmabenstane is now the only prominent survivor, consisted at the beginning of this century of "a number of white stones placed upright, and inclosing half an acre of ground in an oval form" (*New Statistical Account* (Dumfries), 267.

[2] There was an altar dedicated, "Deo Mapono," at Armthwaite in Cumberland (*Monumenta Britannica*, excerpta, p. cxviii.), and there is another dedicated, "Appolini Mapono," in the south transept aisle of Hexham Abbey (Hodge's *Hist. Guide to Hexham*, 104).

[3] Skene's *Ancient Books of Wales*, i. 262; Maxwell's *Dumfries and Galloway*, 133.

[4] There was a famous singer named Maban, brought to Northumberland by Acca, Bishop of Hexham, about the year 709 (Beda, *Hist. Eccl.*, book v., ch. 20).

Solway, one must perceive in it a landmark of extraordinary interest, past which, in alternate flux and reflux, like the sea beside it, there swept for centuries successive invasions. In 1296 it saw advance the first battalion in the War of Independence. In 1448 it gave its name to the battle of Sark, called by contemporaries "the battel of Lochmaben stone." In any view, its geography[1] requires scrutiny.

5. The Two Original Solways.

In the suggestion that the Lochmabenstone marked the Scottish end of the ancient bird of Solway, there are certain difficulties, which one circumstance not patent to the superficial observer tends materially to lessen. The Solway has been receding for centuries. In Roman times, if we might follow Leland, it would be possible to suppose that the Esk was once navigable as far as Netherby, for he says "men alyne have some rynges and staples yn the walles as yt had bene stays or holdes for shyppes." But that is the extravagant. Certain it is, however, that the upper end of the Solway is steadily and rapidly changing, and has long been so. In 1834 the minister of Gretna wrote in the *Statistical Account*[2] that, near the extremity of the firth, "a large tract of marsh land of a lively green has been formed and is still increasing." How great the growth has been since the middle of the seventh century will be best seen from a consideration of a series of maps.

Four rivers flow into the firth at its eastern end. These are the Kirtle, the Sark, the Esk, and the Eden. To understand the effect of these rivers, especially the Esk and the Eden, upon the configuration of the land, it is only necessary to contrast with the present the state of

---

[illegible]

[1] The Lochmaben Stone [illegible] a [illegible] in an essay upon [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

the higher tides, though *terra firma* in spite of, and indeed partly because of, fluctuations in the river channels, has been creeping persistently seaward. Three centuries ago the sea margin lay far east of its present line, and many an acre now under the plough, or green with rich merse grass, then formed part of the sands of the Solway.

The shore from the Eden round to the Esk, and thence to Sarkfoot, is all of one description, alluvial soil laid down by the rivers and the sea. One could guess its past history from the embankment, which tells of struggle with Neptune not even yet at an end, and attests the fact that the flat, low-lying soil within the dyke has in comparatively recent times been subject to the sea.[1] But between Sarkfoot and the mouth of the Kirtle an essential contrast asserts itself. Here is no alluvial swampy tongueland: here is unmistakable hard ground, over which not the highest and wildest tide can prevail, for the low undulating knolls stand above sea level. Of a firm gravelly structure, their character and position are just such as to render them the natural objective of a passage from Rockcliffe or Burgh by Sands, for they are the first and nearest solid land. Here accordingly it is that my conclusions, drawn from chronicles, documents, maps, and topography,[2] place the Scottish end of the great

---

[1] Such embankments on the Solway shore appear early in records which intimate how closely agriculture advanced to its limit of safe cultivation. See, for instance, Holme Cultram charters giving right to sow and reap within the dykes (fossata) at Burgh (*Monasticon*, v. 608). Agriculture is not invariably the winner in the struggle. Two miles of embankment, erected some fifty years ago (foreshadowed in *Old Statistical Account*, x. 219; *New Statistical Account* (Dumfries), 234), opposite Priestside (Ruthwell and Cummertrees parishes) have, with many acres of merse pasture land within the dyke, been washed away owing to a change in the course of the Lochar through the sands.

[2] Cumberland as a county is divided into five wards: Eskdale, Cumberland, Allerdale above Derwent, Allerdale below Derwent, and Leath. Anciently Allerdale appears to have been reckoned as a single division, and Leath and Eskdale were sometimes grouped together, as were Allerdale and Cumberland (Stevenson's *Hist. Doc. Scot.* i. 357, 358). This roughly halved the county east and west. Cumberland ward, extending on the north along the estuary from Cardornock to Rockcliffe, meets on the Esk the ward of Eskdale, which borders it on the east at the junction of the Line with the Esk. Thus the two great divisions of the county met on Esk-bank, at a point near adjacent to the main ford used in recent times (see Crawford's map), situated only a few yards east of a straight

historic passage of the Solway, and here it is that the lone Lochmabenstane still stands like some weather-beaten sentinel grown grey with centuries of duty as watchman of the ford.

On the opposite side, too, is a memorial full of the pathos of history. A mile and a half below Rockcliffe, on the margin of the marsh, a ferry crosses the Eden. It bears[1] the expressive descriptive name of Stonywath, which, although not traced in early writings, may well have been anciently given in contrast to the neighbouring Sulwath. Here probably a protraction of the old Esk-mouth passage carried the native of West Cumberland home from the march meetings held at Sulwath and Lochmabenstane. A glance at the map will show, too, that this point lies on a route for Scotland from Carlisle scarce less direct than that which may be assumed to have existed on the eastern side of the Eden. Now, it is at this very point, less than midway from it to Burgh by Sands, that there stands to this day, on the site of a still older monument, a pillar to the eternal memory of Edward I., who died there in 1307, on the brink of the ford.[2]

9. Geographical Rise and Progress of the Term.

The name of Sulwath, first applied to the eastern ford of the estuary, soon acquired a wider significance. The wath came to be thought of in

---

line betwixt Rockcliffe and the Lochmabenstane. The significance of this, and its bearing on the probable situation of a convenient judicial forum and border meeting-place for the two divisions and for Scotland need no emphasizing. The map of 1552 might favour the inference that the line of this ford would be near the head of the "lange rack," and there also the geographical relationship of the Lochmabenstane is admirably brought out.. In natural features, such as fords, the coincidence of ancient and modern is almost always to be presumed. The ford used sixty years ago must have been quite near the place of the ford of preceding centuries—and this approximation is as close perhaps as historical inquiry may ever discover in view of the great diluvial changes since 1218. One other element of final importance in the question is, that in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries there can be no doubt that "the passage of the Water of Sulwath" was a ferry as well as a ford (*Rotuli Scotiae*, i. 491, 648, 658; ii. 166, 206). The boathouse beside the ford, on Crawford's map (map No. 5), is therefore practically the last link in the chain of continuity.

[1] Ordnance Survey Map, 6-inch scale. I have to thank Mr. George Graham, C.E., for most kindly giving me a tracing of the sheets comprising the Solway.

[2] "Sulwach," says Higden's *Polychronicon* in Trevisa's translation (*R.S.* ii. 69), "is but fyve myle fro Caerlile." King Edward's monument is little more than that distance.

the plural; *vadum* became *vada*. By a very natural process the place-word was extended to the Esk itself, across the channel of which the fords lay, and the whole lower waters of that river came to be known as the "water of Solway." This process, begun[1] in the thirteenth century, became more accentuated later,[2] and the name of "Solway Sands" was attached[3] to the whole eastern extremity of the firth. The firth proper had as yet no specific title, and was regarded as part of the Irish Sea. Thus in 1300, in the *Roll of Caerlaverock*, that famous castle is described as looking westward[4] upon "*la mer de Irlande.*" Hector Boece, Buchanan, and Lesley also, in their histories,[5] all refer to Annandale and Nithsdale as bounded by the Irish Sea. The letterpress of Mercator's *Geographia*[6] says that the Nith and Anand both flow into the Hibernian Sea, although the map (Tabula I. of Scotia) marks "Sulway fl." The corresponding map by Ortelius marks the "Solwey fyrth." Drayton's *Polyolbion* (Song 30) makes the Eden end at Bowness: "At Boulness where myself I on the ocean spend"—the "ocean," which two lines before he styles the Irish Sea. The Solway he appears not to dignify by its own name.[7] In

[1] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 64 has a charter reference to "the river towards Scotland called Sulewaht," of date about 1275.

[2] Hemingburgh, early in the fourteenth century, always says "aqua de Sulewath" (*History*, ed. English Historical Society, ii. pp. 94, 146), a phrase never used by the *Lanercost Chronicle*, with its more exact local information. The Carlisle friar who wrote it knew the place, and writes of entry into England "apud Solewath" (*Chron. Lanercost*, 216, 247). Wyntoun, ix. ch. 2, talks of the "wattyr off Sulway."

[3] "Sulwey sandis" (Bower ii. 402); "Sulway sand" (Blind Harry's *Wallace*, vii. l. 88).

[4] *Roll of Caerlaverock* (ed. Wright), p. 25.

[5] Boece's *Historiae* (ed. 1574), descriptio regni, p. 3; Buchanan, i. 18, 19; Lesley (ed. 1675), p. 9.

[6] I refer to the 1606 edition of Mercator, Tabula II. of Scotia, p. 61. For Ortelius I have used the copy in Stirling's Library, believed to be the edition of 1579.

[7] He thus describes the junction of various rivers at the upper end of the estuary:

"All her attending floods fair Eden do entreat
To lead them down to sea, when Leven comes along,
And by her double spring being mighty them among,
There overtaketh Esk from Scotland that doth hie,
Fair Eden to behold, who, meeting by and bye,
Down from these western sands into the sea do fall."—*Polyolbion*, Song 30.



V. FROM CRAWFORD'S MAP. 1832.

sixteenth century writings the term, whilst in some cases vague,[1] is in others distinctly enough extended to apply westward as far as the Nith, but it persistently retained its characterization as a river. Pitscottie[2] calls it "the river of Solue." In the middle of the seventeenth century, in Blaeu's magnificent atlas[3] the descriptive matter—prepared, so far as regards Scotland, by the leading scholars and geographers of the time—refers to the various rivers of Galloway, and also the Annan Water, as flowing into the Irish Sea. It might thus seem that in five hundred years the name Solway[4] had scarce been able to establish itself west of the mouth of the Annan, but since the seventeenth century its progress has been much more rapid. Under various influences it travelled west and south until, in 1868, the wisdom of Parliament[5] fixed "the limit dividing the Solway Firth from the sea to be a straight line drawn from the Mull of Galloway to Hodbarrow point, in the parish of Millom, in the county of Cumberland," a line which narrowly escapes catching the north point of the Isle of Man. The scope of the present contribution to the annals of the estuary does not extend beyond the limits of the general map which faces the opening chapter.

III. LEGEND, INCIDENT, AND LAW: A.D. 634 TO 1292.

10. Saints' Voyages, A.D. 661 and 684.

St. Cuthbert made, according to Beda,[6] a voyage to the land of the Niduarian Picts, or Picts of Nithsdale. A tempest arose which prevented the return of himself and friends. They were in danger of perishing of cold and

---

[1] Nicholas D'Arfeville's *Navigation* in *Collectanea Scotica*, vol. iii. 120.

[2] Pitscottie (ed. 1814), p. xvi.

[3] Theatrum Scotiae in *Geographia Blaviana*, where see additamentum to descriptiso of Annandale and Nithsdale; also description of Galloway.

[4] Christopher Irvine is worth quoting, *voce* Solvæus (Solovvay Firth): "There is no river of this name, though diverse ones on both sides fall therein."

[5] Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Act, 1868, schedule.

[6] Beda's *Life of St. Cudberct*, ch. 11; *Metrical Life* (Surtees Socy.), p. 52.

hunger, and only after earnest prayer was the divine goodness manifested by the providential appearance of three pieces of dolphin's flesh—"thre peces of porpas," as a translator has it. The saint had foretold that the storm would endure for three days; the fourth brought a tranquil sea and a favouring breeze. In spite of the mention of Nithsdale, one cannot see any convincing local allusion to the Solway in this rather formless story, which has in it nothing so startling as that of a cruise he had, according to another biographer,[1] in the vicinity of the Mull of Galloway (the "Rintsnoc," perhaps Rinns-snook) in a stone boat. The adventures of St. Adamnan in the firth are happily not disfigured by any marvel so gross. The antique narrative of them is, for vigour and inherent truthfulness, unsurpassed by anything similar in the literature of the Middle Ages. What may be ranked as the first historical episode of the Solway makes a strange and picturesque tale, in which the estuary appears under an Irish name, and in which the event adumbrates the growing influence of the orthodox Englishman and the waning of the Celt. In the year 684 Ecgfrid, King of Northumbria, sent an army into Ireland under the command of Beort, his ealdorman. "Miserably they plundered and burnt the churches of God," says the *English Chronicle*,[2] and many prisoners were carried off to Northumbria. When, in 685, King Ecgfrid was slain in battle with the Picts, he was succeeded by Aldfrid, his brother, who had been a pupil of Adamnan, abbot of Iona. The Irish, anxious to have their kinsmen set free, asked Adamnan to go to King Aldfrid and endeavour to procure their release. Adamnan undertook the mission. On his way to Northumbria in 686, he sailed up the Solway. He himself refers to this journey when he mentions[3] that "he went to visit his friend King Aldfrid in Saxonland," and piously adds that "the Lord mercifully saved him from danger." This bald though devout allusion does not compare in interest with the account given by Adamnan's biographer, to whom the Solway seems to have been known as Tracht Romra,

---

[1] *Metrical Life*, p. 23. The Mull was anciently known as Mullirsnook, "Mullyrrys-snwk" (Wyntoun, viii. ch. 18).

[2] Under year 684.

[3] Reeves's *Columba* (ed. 1874), p. 77.

and whose vivid description of a strange voyage, written in the Irish language more than a thousand years ago, still survives as a proof that the picturesque is no modern invention. Here[1] it is:

"The men of Erin besought of Adamnan to go in quest of the captives in Saxonland. Adamnan went to demand the prisoners, and put in at Tracht Romra.[2] The strand is long and the flood rapid, so rapid that if the best steed in Saxonland, ridden by the best horseman, were to start from the edge of the tide when the tide begins to flow, he could only bring his rider ashore by swimming, so extensive is the strand and so impetuous the tide. Now the Saxons were unwilling to permit Adamnan to land upon the shore. 'Push your curraghs on the shore,' cried Adamnan to his people, 'for both their land and sea are obedient to God, and nothing can be done but by God's permission.' The clerics did as they were told. Adamnan drew a circle with his crozier around the curraghs, and God rendered the strand firm under their curraghs, and formed a high wall of the sea round about them, so that the place where they were was an island, and the sea went to her limits past it, and did them no harm. When the Saxons had observed this very great miracle, they trembled for fear of Adamnan, and gave him his full demand."

This fine story, so true to nature in its account of the onrush of the tide, makes it cruel to suggest a prosaic sandbank instead of the isle that rose from the depths at the bidding of the Saint. We can account for Adamnan's success in his mission without ascribing it to any such miracle. He was, Beda tells us, both good and wise; King Aldfrid was his friend;[3] and, last but not least, Adamnan at this very time opportunely acceded to the English and Catholic doctrine in the great observance of Easter controversy.[4] The issue is briefly told in the Irish annals:[5] "Adamnan

---

[1] Irish life of Adamnan, quoted in Reeves's *Columba* (ed. 1874), p. 151.

[2] Doubtless *Tracht* is the same word as Old Welsh *Traeth*, glossed by Giraldus Cambrensis (*Itinerarium Cambriae*, i. cap. 6) as *tractus maris*, and by his editor in Camden's *Anglica Normannica*, as a wide stretch of sand.

[3] *Eccl. Hist.* ch. 15. See also Ceolfrid's letter to Naitan, quoted in ch. 21. Reeves's *Columba* (ed. 1874), p. 77.

[4] Beda, *Eccl. Hist.* ch. 15 and 21. [5] Reeves's *Columba*, preface, p. 152.

conducted sixty captives to Ireland." But his visit was the beginning of the end of a Celtic church independent of Rome.

11. Norse Memories: A.D. 875.

Ethnological aspects of the Solway suggest many large and interesting problems. The Pict of Galloway, the Scot of Scotland and of Ireland, the Briton of Strathclyde or Cumbria, and the Angle and the Norseman are all present with varying prominence in the changing picture presented by successive centuries after the retiral of the Romans. The impress of each on the nomenclature of the districts is striking and instructive. The annals, so far, have been mainly of Romans, Selgovae, Picts, and Scots. The next chapters will tell of the "Saxons of Saxonland," whom the biographer of St. Mungo[1] preferred to designate as the Angles. It will illustrate the growing power of the English race in the wide territory known as Northumbria, including southern Scotland.

The stirring Norse epoch, the invasion of Cumberland by the Danes, makes no direct memorial addition to the annals of the Solway proper. We know that the Danes, under Halfdan in 875, making their headquarters on the Tyne, harried the Picts and Strathclyde Welsh or Cumbrians,[2] destroying Carlisle.[3] The consternation they caused is vividly presented in monastic chronicle.[4] One of the episodes of the well-founded panic caused by "the sword of the Dane" was the attempt to convey St. Cuthbert's body and other relics to Ireland. Ship was taken at the mouth of the Derwent, in Cumberland, but "the wrathful billows rose," and the ship heeled over. A precious manuscript of the Gospels, the penmanship of Bishop Eadfrid, adorned with gold and gems by the anchorite Bilfrid, went overboard. St. Cuthbert evidently objected to go to Ireland, so the ship's head was turned for the shore, and the saint's body was landed at the spot whence it had set sail. Not long afterwards, at Whithorn on the opposite side of the firth, the tide ebbed remarkably, and three miles out from the shore Hunred, one of the band of devotees who had made the ill-starred attempt

[1] *Vita Kentigerni*, cap. 32.

[2] *Anglo-Saxon Chron.*, year 875.

[3] Florence of Worcester, year 1092.

[4] Simeon of Durham in *Decem Scriptores*, 19, 20.

to carry the saint across the channel, found to his great joy the lost volume. Despite its immersion it had lost neither its outward glory nor the inward beauty of its leaves. This famous Lindisfarne Gospel thus wondrously recovered was cherished with enhanced emotion and pride as one of the chief treasures of the church of Durham, as indeed it is now of the British Museum—a noble monument of Anglo-Saxon piety. It has often occurred to me as at least possible that to some such migration and mischance of the sea as this, when the Danish terror lay upon the land, may be due the presence at Ruthwell[1] (anciently Ryvell) of the superb cross there. Tradition persistently remembered[2] that it had been drawn by oxen from Priestside (formerly Priestwoodside) on the Solway shore.

The Northmen's fury was soon spent. They came as marauders, but quickly turned colonists. The very year after their descent on Northumbria they are said to have divided the lands they had won there. Ere long Cumberland, even more than Northumberland, was known as a special home of the Northmen.[3] No legend has kept alive the memory of this large colonization, but on the farm of Graitney Mains there stood, until demolished by the plough in the present century, an oblong earthen mound, terminating in a point at both ends, shaped like the hull of a ship with its bottom upwards, possibly a ship barrow raised over some viking's grave.[4] Place-names on both sides of the firth, and in the firth itself, are a much surer record of the Norse land-taking. A few of the old descriptive geographical names of the Solway and its sands, particularly those of Norse affinity, merit a glance.

Firth,[5] not known to me as occurring before the sixteenth century in

---

[1] Ruthwell's annual fair, under its charter granted in 1509, began on St. Cuthbert's Day. *Acts Parl. Scot.* ii. 274.

[2] *New Statistical Account* (Dumfriesshire), 223; *The Ruthwell Cross*, by Rev. James M'Farlan, p. 18.

[3] Henry of Huntingdon (end of book v.); *Monumenta Britannica*, 750; Cumberland spoken of as a place "ubi maxima mansio Dacorum erat."

[4] Wilson's *Prehistoric Annals of Scotland*, 57.

[5] In the *Lib. Quot. Gard.* (1299-1300), p. 279, mention is made of "le Frith," meaning, however, I believe, the Firth of Forth.

connection with our estuary, is, of course, Norse. *Wath*, though quite possibly of Anglo-Saxon origin is yet of Northumbrian type, suggestive of Norse influence.[1] A low-lying rock cluster, which rises and no more than rises above the level of the sands, is always called a *sker*—more anciently *sker*. The word occurs not fewer than fifteen times, and is indubitably Norse. The commonest term for a headland is *ness* or *nose*, also certainly Norse. Celtic *pol* or *pow*, and Norse *bek* are common names for streams falling into the firth. *Dale*, in Nithsdale, Annandale, and Eskdale, is Norse. Annandale had as its older form Annanderdale, which came in room of the still older Celtic Strat Anant, or Strath of Annan. This Annanderdale is peculiarly noticeable as an instance of the Norse genitive in *er*, more correctly *ar*: the river Annand, like the Nid in Yorkshire, took a genitive in *er*, and the Annand's dale, after some uncertainty between Annandesdale and Annanderdale, became decisively Annanderdale, just as the Nid's valley became Nidderdale.

Grune,[2] the point north of Silloth, is an ancient geographical term,[3] denoting a snout. In the fishings of the Solway one or two other terms of unusual suggestiveness have been preserved. It was a curious and unjust remark of a friar of Carlisle[4]—who might have spoken otherwise had he remembered the fates of his own city—that the Norsemen "had more skill in fishing than in fighting." Their fighting has left its record; so perhaps has their fishing, in terms and things either still in use or not yet forgotten. *Raise nets*, in earlier form *rais-nets*, were floated with the current, and may have been so styled from Norse *rás*, a channel. *Haav*

---

[1] Cleasby and Vigfusson's *Dictionary*, *voce* vath, notes its frequency in Iceland. Cp. instances in Scotland and the Isle of Man: *Retours Caithness*, 6; *Retours Sutherland*, 2; *Chron. Manniae* (ed. Munch), pp. xxxii. 5, 18.

[2] Mr. Glennie (*Arthurian Localities*, 75), endorsing an inference by Sir F. Madden, speaks of the "Chapel of the Green" at this headland. Grune, however, is not Green, and the maps say, "Chappel of ye Grune."

[3] Barbour's *Bruce* (ed. Jamieson), xiv. 914; *Scriptores post Bedam*, 407; *Quarterly Review*, July, 1895, p. 20; Harrison's *England* (Scott Library), p. 273; *State Papers, Henry VIII.*, i. p. 17.

[4] *Lanercost Chron.* 79.

nets, used by wading out into the tide, may well be from the Norse also, as *haf* is Old Norse for sea, and as such was not unfamiliar in Scottish geography[1] and records.[2] It is evident from these instances[3] that the Norse in Solway names is an appreciable quantity.

Yet another name is remarkable. On the old map[4] of 1552, the strand of the mouth of the Esk, at its junction with the sands, is labelled "lange rack." The sandbanks between Silloth and Salterness were known[5] about 1563 as the "Longrake Sande." Hence, it is highly probable that, in and before the sixteenth century, the term Lange Rack applied at the east end, synonymous with Long Rake at the west, must have designated the channel between these two extremities—the sea-river, near twenty miles long, formed by the united outflow of the waters of the Solway basin. When the tide is out this stream is seen threading its way through the sands, and widening as it nears the permanent sea water, in which it merges at last. Viewed from the top of Criffell, at low ebb, it makes an impressive part in the great picture outstretched eastward beneath—the ever narrowing current veining with its dark sinuous line the far-reaching expanse of 20,000 acres of yellow-brown sand. A rack, the geographers tell us,[6] is the Northmen's name for a crooked narrow channel difficult of navigation. The classical example is the Skager Rack of Denmark, where, to the east of the Skaw,[7] the sea way for ships is a

---

[1] Irlands Haf is Norse name for Irish Sea, in Map of Skotland in *Orkneyinga Saga* (ed. Anderson), 1873.

[2] *Acts Parl. Scot.* i. 420, 461.

[3] *Leister*, perhaps the most famous of Solway fishing words—the name for the fish spear—appears to be of Norse origin.

[4] Above, ch. 8, map No. 2.

[5] Bruce Armstrong's *Liddesdale*, appx. cix: "The mouthe of the Water of Nytht: a schallow revare; noo weshalles can come furtht of Englonde in yt but at the ful sea, and that at the crope of the tyde, soo that tha mon pass the Longrake sande in the myddes of Sulwaye."

[6] Canon Taylor's *Names and their Histories*; Lippincott's *Gazetteer*; Oliver & Boyd's *Pronouncing Gazetteer*, *voce* Skager-rack.

[7] The Skager Rack takes the first member of its name from the Skaw. In old maps, such as that in Blaeu's Atlas, it is marked as wholly to the east and south-east of that cape.

strait and winding passage marked for miles by a series of buoys between the sandbanks. So early as the fourteenth century a fishery at Aberdeen was called[1] the Rak or Raik. It lay in the tortuous tidal and sandy mouth[2] of the Dee. The meaning of the Lang Rack of the Solway is thus far from obscure.

There are no islands at all in the area of the Solway Firth dealt with here, and only two or three very small ones in it altogether. One of them, now called Heston, lies just outside of the Rough Firth—a noticeable name—at the mouth of the Urr. Heston is believed to be the island on which Sir Dougal MacDowall had his "peel" in the middle of the fourteenth century, when it was known as Estholme.[3] "Holm" is a well-known Norse word for island.

The southmost point of Galloway, and the westmost on the northern shore of the firth is the Mull. Barbour, quoted by Wyntoun, calls it[4] the Mullyr-snwk. Snook is a geographical term believed to be of Northern origin,[5] a metaphorical "snout."[6] The grammar of the combination, with its genitive in *r*, is, however, still more decisive. It was by exact parity of nomenclature that the Norsemen called[7] the Calf of Mull (Myl) the Mýlar-Kálf. The Norsemen's impress on the Solway's historical geography is thus very plain: it begins at the headland round which their galleys came, and it reaches the extreme navigable point, the ford of Sulwath.

---

[1] *Exchequer Rolls*, i. 546, 552; *Burgh Records, Aberdeen* (Spalding Club), 1398-1570, p. 399, etc. Sometimes spelt Rack (*Retours Aberdeen*, 459, 471), though usually Raik.

[2] See the charming pictorial map of 1661 in Gordon's *Description of both Towns of Aberdeen* (Spalding Club).

[3] *Rotuli Scotiae*, i. 634, 635, 715; Bain's *Cal.* iii. 1578. This holm peel reminds one that Peel, in the Isle of Man, was known as Holm Peel, the castle now standing on an island.

[4] Barbour's *Bruce*, i. 188; Wyntoun, viii. 2736; Bower, ii. 224.

[5] Jamieson's *Dictionary*. See, however, *snoca* in Earle's *Land Charters*.

[6] Instances are Turnberry "Snuke" (Barbour's *Bruce*, iv. 556); "Snewke" in Blaeu's map of Holy Island. At Berwick the point was sometimes styled Snoke, sometimes Nesse (Bain's *Cal.* iii. 1193, iv. 68).

[7] *Hakonar Saga* (*R.S.*), ch. 326, 327; Johnstone's *Haco's Expedition*, ch. 20.

12. Traditions of the Scotiswath, A.D. 937.

Fergus, the son of Erc, the first of the genuine historical kings of Scotland, is credited by Fordun with subduing the lands on both sides of the Scotiswath (*vadum Scoticum*) from Stanemore (*mora lapidea*) and the Hebrides to the Orkneys.[1] It was a far cry from Fordun's day back to that of Fergus Mac Erc, who died, by some accounts, in 501; but the passage, however inexact as history, has a particular geographical value. Fordun supplies his own explanations, as has been seen already. The Scotiswath[2] was the Sulwath, and the south-eastern limit of the diocese of St. Mungo (who died about the year 603) was the Rere Cross on Stanemore,[3] a summit still part of the boundary of Westmorland and Yorkshire, as of old it was of Cumbria and Northumbria. We shall meet again the collocation of the Rere Cross and the Solway, but meantime a curious legend demands attention.

According to the sober English chronicle, King Athelstan in the year 934 fared into Scotland with a land force as well as a ship force, and harried it much. Three years later he fought his renowned battle of Brunanburh, Brunesburh, Brunnanwerch, or Bruneswerce, the site of which remains unsettled.[4] Out of the expedition of 934, or the victory of 937—more probably the latter—there had by the thirteenth century grown up a picturesque legend to the great glory of St. John of Beverley,[5] on whose altar Athelstan had laid his dagger,[6] as a pledge of his material gratitude if the saint could secure him victory. Under the banner of St. John he proceeded north. The Scots hearing of his advance, retired across the river,

---

[1] "Regiones cis citraque vadum Scoticum . . . de mora lapidea viz. et Inchegal ad insulas Orcades" (Fordun, iii. ch. 2).

[2] Ch. 6 above. [3] Fordun, iii. ch. 29.

[4] Burnswork in Dumfriesshire, nine miles from the Solway Firth, is one of the claimants to the honours of this place.

[5] Palgrave's *Documents and Records*, i. 117.

[6] The knife has a distinct place in legal symbolism: Pollock and Maitland's *Hist. of English Law*, ii. 84; Thévenin's *Textes Relatifs* (Collection de Textes), Nos. 50, 52, 105, 136, 143. Ducange, *voce Investura*: *Per cultellum*.

which is called the Scots' Wath,[1] so that within their own bounds they might the more securely prepare themselves to resist. When the king came to the river and learned that the Scots had crossed, he ordered his men to pitch their tents upon the bank. During the night there appeared a personage in priestly robes, who said, "King Athelstan, prepare thy men on the morrow to cross that river for battle with the Scots." It was St. John of Beverley; and the vision closed with a promise that the English king would be victorious. Next morning Athelstan's army, eager for battle, crossed the river, and found the Scots arrayed on the other side. A great battle ensued, in which, of course—whether it was the memorable fight of Brunanburh[2] or one of less note—St. John's presage of victory was gloriously fulfilled.

Such tales have always a strong family likeness, and there is nothing very distinctive about this one. It is more notable because of its reference to Scotiswath—a river which was called the Scots' Wath or ford—than because Solway legends are scarce.

Of these there is another which, however extraordinary, has nothing miraculous. After what has been shown with regard to what the Solway was, it is not incongruous that its earliest recorded, albeit dateless, maritime engagement should be alleged to have been a battle of horse! For this Camden[3] is sponsor. He tells us of Burgh by Sands that "the

---

[1] "Flumen quod dicitur Scottorum vadum."

[2] Points favouring the Dumfriesshire site of Brunanburh are: (1) Some chronicles read Bruneswerce and Brunnanwerch for the name (*Mon. Brit.*, 808; *Symeon of Durham* (*R.S.*), i. 76). Compare spellings of Burnswork, *e.g.* Burnyswarke (1542), Burneswark (1623), Brunswark (1661). (2) Athelstan's enemy was Anlaf, Norse king of Ireland, with allied Scots, Galwegians, Picts, and Cumbrians, to whom the Solway would afford a convenient place of junction. (3) Although various authors say that Anlaf's entry into England was by the Humber, that is geographically unlikely; and the English chronicle, the oldest and best authority, does not name the Humber, and appears to imply a different quarter. (4) The battle was near the sea, for, after the defeat, the survivors of the confederate force were driven back to their ships. (5) The English chronicle says they departed over the deep water to Dublin. (6) This Athelstan legend tends distinctly to locate the battle in the vicinity of the Solway. See Bain's *Hamilton Papers*, i. p. lxxxvi., for the evidence that, in 1542, James V. on Burnswork watched his army busy at the work of destruction on the English side of the Esk.

[3] *Britannia* (1695), 830.

inhabitants say that under this burgh, in the very aestuary, there was a sea fight between the Scotch and English, and that when the tide was out it was managed by the horse."

13. The Solway as a Boundary: A.D. 1092-1157.

Whilst in a broad sense the western waters of the estuary always formed the boundary between Cumbria, the great Cumberland, on the one hand, and Galloway, the province of the "stranger Gaels," on the other, this, strictly, was not always admittedly the case. Though each enjoyed at times a precarious independence, the forces for unity were at work in spite of tribal protest. In the seventh century both Cumbria and Galloway were subject to the English kings, and in the tenth and eleventh to the kings of Scotland. In 945 Cumbria had been granted by Edmund of England to Malcolm, King of Scots. In 1069, it was claimed,[1] Cumbria included Galloway. William the Conqueror, invading Scotland in 1072, entered "æt tham Gewæde," according to one MS. of the *English Chronicle*. He fared in "ofer the Wæth," according to another. The annals of Waverley, long after, term[2] the place "Scodwade." Much learned ink[3] has been shed to prove what place was meant, in support of the rival claims of the Tweed, the Scotewater or Forth, and the Scotiswath or Solway. King William advanced with a "land force" and a "ship force," and after crossing "the ford," so ill defined in the *English Chronicle*, he reached, according to other authorities, a place[4] called Abernithi, which some historical speculators[5] have sought to find, not on the Tay in the modern Abernethy, but in the confluence of the Nith with the Solway. Some annalists, considerably more recent and suspected,

---

[1] "Cronica de Karleolo" in Palgrave's *Documents and Records*, i. 70.

[2] *Annales Waverl.* (*R.S.*), year 1072.

[3] Goodall's introduction to Bower's *Scotichronicon*, ch. 12; Hailes's *Annals*, year 1072. A correction and addition by Lord Hailes is as follows: "At this day the Solway, where it becomes navigable, is called the *Waed* or the *Scotwaed*."

[4] Florence of Worcester, Ralf de Diceto, etc., year 1072.

[5] Goodall and Hailes where last cited. Ailred of Rievaux calls the place Abernith, but the context scarcely consists with the theory of the Nith-mouth.

represent the Conqueror as returning through Cumberland and fortifying Carlisle, but it must be owned that this evidence, which otherwise might have lent some colour to the Nith-mouth inference, is quite late and unreliable.[1] The local historian must needs relinquish with a sigh any hope of absolute proof that William the Conqueror ever crossed the sludgy ford of Solway.

Cumberland, it is well known, formed no part of the Conqueror's England, and was wholly omitted in the great survey of Doomsday. Yet tradition soon forgets, and at an early date it was told how William the Bastard bestowed[2] all the lands of the county on Ranulf le Meschyn: "all the land," as a thirteenth century statement[3] of the claim defined it, "from the place called Rere Crosse upon Staynmor as far as the river towards Scotland called Sulewaht to the true marches there between England and Scotland." This was probably no truer than Boece's circumstantial account of the erection of the "Re-crois" by the Conqueror as the southern limit of his grant of Cumbria to Malcolm III., with statues of the two kings adorning the pedestal.[4]

It was not until 1092, when William Rufus seized, restored, and occupied Carlisle, building a fort or castellum there,[5] that the Solway took that place as the march between England and Scotland, which it maintained throughout the reign of Henry I. Henry strengthened the English hold on Carlisle and the shire by walling the city.[6] On his death in 1135, David I. of Scotland took advantage of the civil war to wrest Carlisle, partly by war, partly by diplomacy, out of the hands of Stephen, and to reassert successfully the Scottish claim to Cumbria. David made Carlisle his capital or residence, and some time after the peace of 1139 he heightened the city walls, and built the great keep there.[7]

---

[1] *Flores Historiarium*, year 1072. One MS. of Matthew Paris also has the Carlisle story. M. Paris, *Chronica Majora* (*R.S.*), ii. 8. See Langtoft (*R.S.*), i. 412, 422-4.

[2] "Distributio Cumbriae," in Camden's *Britannia*, 845. *Monasticon*, iii. 584.

[3] *Circa* 1275; Bain's *Cal.* ii. 64.

[4] Boece (ed. 1574), bk. 12, fo. 258[b].

[5] *English Chronicle*, year 1092.

[6] *Pipe Rolls*, years 1130-32; Bain's *Cal.* i. 26.

[7] "Cronica de Huntingdon," in Palgrave's *Documents and Records*, i. 103; Fordun, v. ch. 32; appx. iii. ch. 37. For detail of the proof of the building, see my "Keep of Carlisle," in *Notes and Queries*, eighth series, viii. 321.

"The Kyng Dawy wan till his crown,
All fra the Wattyr off Tese off brede,
North on till the Wattyr off Twede,
And fra the Wattyr of Esk the est
Till off Stanemore the Rere-Cors west." [1]

Whilst he lived the Solway was thus no boundary of the realm, but after his death at Carlisle, in 1153, his grandson, Malcolm IV., retained Southern Cumbria only four years. In 1157 this Malcolm the Maiden ceded[2] to Henry II. "the city of Carlisle," and thenceforth Cumberland, long an appanage of the Scottish crown, passed definitively into English territory. Thenceforth, too, the Solway became a vital part of the marches of the realms, giving a sanction of history to the tradition that the feudal service of the lieges of Westmorland and Cumberland was restricted, as they themselves declared[3] to Edward II., to meeting the kings of England on their progress towards Scotland at the Rere Cross, to going in the vanguard to "la Marche de Solewathe," and on the return to taking the rearguard from Solway to the Rere Cross again. Apparently this duty of escort to and from the normal place of passage into Scotland lay on the tenants by cornage,[4] who, by a tradition resulting from a mistaken etymology,[5] were also accredited with the function of the blowing of horns,[6] somewhat fantastically referred for its origin to a supposed old custom associated with the defence of the Roman Wall. More than a century after the cession of Cumberland to the English, the Bishop of Glasgow claimed[7] that his diocese still extended, as it had once done, as far as the Rere Cross.

14. A Pretended Ballad of the Crusades: A.D. 1189.

We have seen a saint sailing up the Solway in the seventh century. If we might accept a certain ballad,[8] we should see a group of crusaders

[1] Wyntoun, vii. lines 1054-58.

[2] Ralf de Diceto, *Ymagines Hist.*, year 1157; Fordun, *Annals*, ch. 2.

[3] Bain's *Cal.* iii. 716. [4] *Testa de Nevill*, 380, 381.

[5] Cornage was really noutgeld or horngeld, a cattle rent or tax (*Bracton's Note Book*, 1270; Bain's *Cal.* i. 26).

[6] Camden's *Britannia*, 839; cp. Fordun, iii. 4. [7] *Lanercost Chron.* 65.

[8] *The Bedesman on Nidsyde* (London: printed for S. Hooper, No. 112 High Holborn. 1790).

setting sail to join the host of Richard I., under the leadership of Sir Eustace de Maxwell.

> "Schir Eustace Maccuswall he's cau'd,
> In sothe Skottlonde he bode;
> On his bred banner stode bedight
> The egil and the rode."[1]

Describing this commander as "Thane of Stra-Nid sae green," and telling of his Dumfriesshire companions-in-arms, including the "Thane of hie Sanquhar's peel," the balladist tells of the departure from the Solway to join the English king in his capital.

> "In twa score Carvels frae Cockpool
> Wee brilzean Lundin raucht,
> A myghtye meany and valziant thrang,
> Wha fremit ferly's saucht."

So they set out for Scanderoon "owre the sea sae braid."

It is unfortunate for the ballad's pretensions as an antique that its rhymes and diction should so palpably betray it, and that it should bristle with neo-archaisms. Historically there was no Eustace de Maxwell of Carlaverock in the days of Richard Coeur de Lion. There never was a thane of Strath Nith or a thane of Sanquhar. Peel was an unknown term in Scotland until Edward I. introduced it, and Sanquhar peel is probably an example of it very late in origin. It must be said, however, that there is some faint traditional evidence[2] for one representative of the Maxwell family having gone to Jerusalem as a crusader in the thirteenth century, under the banner of King Louis IX. The carvels from Cockpool, nevertheless, are most probably the creation of a poetic imagination, stirred by the renaissance of the ballad, late in the eighteenth century. The poem apparently had its origin at Friars' Carse. Some critics have suspected that Burns

---

[1] These figures have appeared since the twelfth century on the arms of the Maxwells. The rood is the Brucian saltire. Compare Scott's *Lay of the Last Minstrel*, iv. 28:

> "Lord Maxwell ranks his merry men good
> Beneath the eagle and the rood."

[2] See extract from the *Maenelogium Cisterciense*, in Dugdale's *Monasticon* (1846), vii. 1155.

had a hand in assisting Captain Robert Riddell to compose it, but such a suspicion seems an injustice to the Bard.

15. The Avenging Eden: A.D. 1216.

Many a strange tale is told of unwary passengers overtaken by the tide while in the act of crossing the Solway. The geographical thesis of the preceding section, and the maps, explain that under some conditions there would be a considerable expanse of sand to be crossed at the original ford. They suggest also several circumstances adding to the danger of surprise. The long time necessarily occupied in crossing, and the liability to mistake the safest track and fall in with a quicksand, must often have made the risks of the passage very serious. A half hour's miscalculation of the tide might well cost many a passenger's life. The earliest narrative of this sort belongs to the year 1216. King John had invaded Scotland, with a ferocity carried by himself personally to an unkingly extreme. In return, King Alexander II. made a destructive inroad across the border, and ravaged Cumberland.[1] The *Melrose Chronicle* states that he granted his peace to religious persons, and that it was against his instructions that a band of his followers pillaged the Abbey of Holme Cultram, in which, as a daughter-house to Melrose, the chronicler naturally took a close interest. Laden with their spoil the Scots, returning, required to cross the Eden. That "dainty Cumbrian queen," as Drayton calls it, when it reaches Rockcliffe, is nearing the close of its journey from the shoulder of a Yorkshire mountain at the head of the Mallerstang. At Rockcliffe its broad and limpid waters ripple over a pebbly channel, washing the base of a high red cliff. A little further down its waters take somewhat of the tawny complexion of the Solway sands, through which they are beginning to flow. The neighbouring sandy foreshore is coated with rough merse grass, on which numerous herds of cattle graze. As one walks along the marsh skirting the river, a quiet, sibilant, but penetrating sound from the sea is the

[1] This was before his capture of Carlisle city and castle in the summer.

announcement of a wave racing up the Eden. A line of advancing foam breaks gently on each side of the sandy channel. In a few minutes, where before was a narrow current of fresh water with a wide margin of sand, there is a broad volume of brine, and the estuary of the Eden is flowing "from bank to brae." In the winter season the scene, impressive under any conditions, is much intensified, especially if the tide is high and there is a southerly gale behind. Then the sea approaches with great speed, gaining as it goes; the wave is white with tumbling foam; a great curve of broken surf follows in its wake; and the white horses of the Solway ride in to the end of their long gallop from the Irish Sea with a deep and angry roar.

In February, 1216, some terror-stricken survivor may have witnessed this tumultuous onrush of waters, whilst his companions-in-arms, heedless of danger, were fording the Eden. Suddenly the tide was upon them—escape was impossible—and 1900 men were swept away.[1] What wonder if a monk saw in that pitiful scene of death the arm of God, which only slumbered till "that plundering crew"[2] of Scots was in mid channel,

> "Then bade the deep in wild commotion flow,
> And heaved an ocean on their march below."[3]

16. The Fleet of Alexander III.: A.D. 1264.

Alan of Galloway was in a sense the pioneer of the Scottish claims to the Isle of Man. His expedition in 1228, when he left his bailies behind him to collect tribute, has all the appearance of an affair of conquest, in which he and his colleague, the Earl of Athole, were fighting for their own hand.[4] The Norse kingship, long divided against itself though it was, had strength enough to survive until the battle of Largs, in 1263. It is significant of the great uprising of national spirit in Scotland, due to that defeat of the northern power, that it should have been so directly

[1] *Chronicle of Melrose*, year 1216; *Lanercost Chron.* p. 18. Fordun, however, says nothing of this episode, narrating merely that Alexander, "near Carlisle, crossing the water of Sulwath, returned to his own territories with infinite plunder" (*Annals*, ch. 34).

[2] Camden's phrase (*Britannia*, 831). [3] Thomas Campbell.

[4] *Chronicon Manniae*, year 1228.

followed by energetic action for the annexation of the Isle of Man, and for the effectual incorporation of the western isles. King Haco, brooding over his ill fortune, had, with the remnant of his navy, reached Orkney only to die. No sooner was it known that he was dead than Alexander III. prepared to invade the Isle of Man, whose uneasy sceptre was held by Magnus, the son of Olaf. All was in readiness; early in 1264 the fleet was moored to carry the army across the channel to the little isle.[1] Where the ships lay is not on record, but as the king's journey was by way of Dumfries, it is no idle speculation that the Solway Firth, near the mouth of the Nith, may have seen the gathering of Alexander's vessels. But Magnus Olafson did not show fight: he sent his nuncios to declare his willingness to come to terms. His letter that he would hold[2] his land of Man in vassalage is one of the lost muniments of Scotland. And promise was not enough. Alexander persisted in his expedition in spite of promises, and the Kinglet of Man hasted in person to Dumfries, where he became Alexander's man, doing homage for his kingdom, and undertaking feudal service with ten "pirate galleys"—*pirate*[3] was once a word of innocent associations—five of them with four and twenty oars, and five of them with twelve. Followed up as this was by proceedings against the refractory Hebridean islanders,[4] it was a well-omened effort for the consolidation of the Scottish realm. The King of Man's feudal holding as a Scottish vassal was not destined to endure. Magnus died in the end of 1265, and next year the suzerainty of Scotland was converted, as far as treaty with Norway could convert it, into actual sovereignty[5] of Man and the Sudereys, and all the other isles on the west and southern sides of the "Great Haff." The tenure of Man by galley service may well have been the basis of a marine policy, the continued maintenance

---

[1] Fordun, *Annals*, ch. 56.

[2] "Item litera Regis Mannie quod teñebit terram Mannie de Rege Scocie" (*Acts Parl. Scot.* i. 112). The future tense of the verb makes it unlikely that this could have been the actual homage.

[3] Ducange, *Pirata.*

[4] Fordun, where last cited.

[5] *Chronicon Manniae*, year 1266; *Acts Parl. Scot.* i. 420.

of which is attested by more than one of Robert the Bruce's west coast charters, having reddenda of ship service,[1] sometimes with twenty-six or even forty oars.

17. March Law: A.D. 1249-1292.

The earliest contemporary mention of the Solway under that name belongs to the year 1218. The turbulent Reginald, King of the Isles—of whose doings the chronicle of Man is so full—had safe conduct to present himself before Henry III., and do homage. Henry issued commands[2] that the Norse kinglet was to be met by an escort, either at "Sulewad," Carlisle, or Lancaster. Whether Reginald was expected by sea or land is uncertain, but there can be no uncertainty or indefiniteness about the place of meeting first on the list. How well defined a place it was is manifest from the border laws.

The border sheriffs and jurors who, in 1249, declared the laws of the marches[3] between Scotland and England, deliver it as established that "the counties of Carlisle and Dumfries ought to answer at Sulewath, according to the laws and customs heretofore in use there between the two realms."[4] It would be superfluous to enter at any length upon the code of march law then in force, with its references to "Handwarcelle," or wager of battle, as the normal ordinance. Still less is it necessary to go into detail to show that this border code remained living and effective, as seen from documentary confirmations,[5] in 1280 and 1292. But one clause in the statute is peculiarly germane to the geographical questions already discussed. If a borderer in the one country was found in possession of a horse, ox, cow, or pig claimed by a subject of the other country, and if after wager of battle had been ordained the possessor decided at the eleventh hour to admit the other party's claim, he had to give notice

---

[1] "Unius navis viginti et sex remorum cum hominibus et victualibus pertinentibus ad eandem"—MS. Adv. Lib. 34. 2. 1, vol. ii. (pagination series towards end), p. 49; see also pp. 77, 78: also (pagination series by letters), P. Nos. 121, 122, 123.

[2] Bain's *Cal.* i. 696. [3] *Acts Parl. Scot.* i. 413-16. [4] *Ibid.* 414.

[5] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 183; Stevenson's *Hist. Doc.* i. 357: see above, ch. 5.

of the fact, and at the appointed time to drive the beast into the Esk.[1] If it passed the midstream in safety, the wrongous holder was quit of the claim, but if it sank before it could reach the midstream, he was answerable for its value. A special interest attaches to this curious provision, since it illustrates two facts: (1) That the midstream of the Esk was the division line of the kingdoms, and (2) that the crossing of the Esk was at Sulewath.

It can be proved from purely English documents that, in the thirteenth century, the territory between the Esk and the Sark, subsequently known as the Debatable Land, was not debatable at all. It was admittedly Scottish soil. Conclusive evidence is found in the facts relative to the Barony of Kirkandrews on Esk,[2] now represented by the English parish of that name, which includes Solway Moss and the whole land south of it between the Esk and the Sark. This barony was never claimed as English before the fifteenth century.

In a writing of date 1282 relative to Arthuret in England across the Esk from the area now known as Solway Moss, there is very distinct proof that that area was Scottish. The name Solway Moss is not original. The battle of 1542, which has made it historic, was generally styled by contemporaries not Solway but Sollome or Solane Moss.[3] The extinct hamlet from which it had its name was Salom; in 1280 a jury of Cumberland made express mention[4] of "Salom in Scotland." In fact the

---

[1] *Acts Parl. Scot.* i. 416: The reference to the Esk is in the vernacular version only.

[2] The disputed territory largely consisted of this barony, which was treated as Scottish by the Scots (*Robertson's Index*, 5, 6, 9, 12, 20, 25, 27) and English alike (Bain's *Cal.* iii. 1454), even in the fourteenth century. See also Mr. T. J. Carlyle's paper on "The Debateable Land" (*Dumfries Antiq. Soc. Transactions*, 1865-66, p. 19).

[3] Map of 1552 (No. 2 above) has "Solo̅me Mosse," although editorially misread in the National MSS. Sollom, Solame, Solane, Solen, are variants. (*Diurnal of Occurrents*, 25; Pitscottie (1813), 404; Camden's *Britannia*, 835; Godscroft (1743), p. 110; Nicholson and Burns, *Westm. and Cumberland*, i., p. xlv.; Knox's *History* (ed. Laing), 87; Marjoreybanks, *Annals*, 1514-1591, p. 8). For Solum as a surname see Bain's *Cal.* i. 1702. Salom is named in Rymer's *Foedera*, 15th March, 1384-5.

[4] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 208, p. 65.

boundary in the thirteenth, and much—if not all—of the fourteenth century, was the Esk. It was not until 1552 that it was finally shifted to the Sark.

IV. SALTWORKS AND FISHERIES.

18. Saltmaking.

In its saltworks the Solway possessed an industry of great importance and high antiquity. At intervals all along both its Scottish and English shores there were *salinae* or saltworks. These were all situated at places where a loose and porous clayey sand, called "sleech," formed natural salt beds, presenting a surface capable of retaining a very heavy solution of salt after being covered by the tide. The heat of the summer sun disclosed the salty particles glittering on the sleech like hoar frost. From time to time in due season the salters,[1] as the makers of salt were called, first collected the surface sleech on the salt bed by a kind of sledge-drag or scraper, called a "hap," drawn by a horse, carted it to the merse or grassy beach, and laid it in heaps beside the place where, after some time, it was to be filtered. Neither the apparatus nor process of filtration was complex. A hole dug in the merse formed a "kinch" or pit: its bottom and sides were puddled with clay to make it watertight: on the bottom, above the clay, peats were laid: the peats in turn were covered with a layer of sods: sleech was put on the sods till the kinch was nearly filled to the brim, and finally, as much salt water was added as the kinch would hold. Filtering through the sleech and the sods, the brine at length, when strong enough to float an egg, was allowed to escape by a tube or spout into a wooden reservoir, out of which it was lifted and

[1] This description of the saltworks, which at some expense to strictness of chronological order is inserted here to avoid future explanations, is drawn to some extent from the *Old Statistical Account* (Ruthwell Parish), vol. x. 221, but chiefly from Dr. Henry Duncan's paper on the subject, forming Appendix No. VI. to Singer's *Agriculture of Dumfries*. Some points are added from local information. See also Chalmers's *Caledonia*.

carried in pails to the salt-pans.[1] These were broad, shallow metal pans, beneath which great fires of peat were lit. After about six hours' boiling the process was complete; the liquid of the brine was wholly evaporated, and the pans full of the finished article. The name of Saltcotes[2] was given to the little cluster of buildings which contained the pans, the "girnels," or stores in which the salt was kept, and the dwellings of the salters. Such was the system pursued on the Solway in the end of last century, and there is small reason to doubt that substantially the same primitive and laborious[3] mode of manufacture prevailed from early times. It was then a most important industry, salt forming, no doubt, a staple article of commerce, for the supply of which the long sandy stretches of the Solway offered conditions so favourable as to create a practical monopoly there.

"Upon the banks of Sulway in June and July," says John Monipennie,[4] writing in 1612, "the country people gather up the sand within the flood marke, bringing it to land, and laying it in great heapes; thereafter they make the salt spring water, and cast it upon the sand (with a certaine device), causing the water to run through the sand into a hollow pit purposely made to receive the water, which water being boyled in a little vessel of lead, there is made thereof good whyte salt after the temperance of the weather. This place is called the Salt Coates."[5]

---

[1] In a Prestonpans title deed which I examined professionally some years ago, a reference in the "pertinents" clause to a "patella *lie* buckett pott" led me to suppose that bucket pots were the equivalent of the pans.

[2] At Saltcoats in Ayrshire, in the summer of 1887, I saw an old deserted salt-pan surviving its usefulness by half a century, while a melancholy old building called "the saut girnel," near at hand, was an equally curious reminiscence.

[3] It was very hard work: hence, doubtless, the fact of the emancipation of the labourers being so late achieved. See note, ch. 21.

[4] In his "True Description, etc., of Scotland," reprinted in *Collectanea Scotica* (Glasgow, 1818), vol. i.

[5] If not here a generic term, this is probably the Saltcots of Ruthwell (see ch. 21 below).

19. Saltworks.

The value of saltworks at a remote period is well seen in the care with which a formal title to them is entered in the early cartularies. Important evidence concerning the Solway salt workings has thus been preserved. In the Book of Melrose[1] there is entered a charter executed by Richard Fleming, chamberlain of William de Brus, Lord of Annandale, in favour of the monks of Melrose. A witness to it was Roland of Galloway, so that the latest possible date is 1210. It conveyed a saltwork on the side of the great way (*magna via*) at the church of Rainpatrick. The ground included was bounded on the east by a great ditch, on the south by the sea, and on the west by another saltwork already conveyed to the monks by William de Brus. Pertinents of the grant were pasturage for four oxen and a horse, and a right of fuel. The property was subject to the annual burden of a pound of pepper.[2] The other saltwork at this point was held of William de Brus for payment of a mark of silver, which, however, he never exacted, and which his son subsequently discharged altogether.[3]

Rainpatrick, once an independent parish, is now merged in the parish of Graitney. The church sat close to the sea, but even the spot it once hallowed has been washed away. Its prominent situation as a headland, a mile west of the Lochmabenstane, made it so much of a typical border site, that the Red Kirk has in a sense passed into history.[4] Its whereabouts is still indicated by the name of Redkirk Point, applied to what remains of the headland. In 1294 the monks of Melrose made a bargain

---

[1] *Liber de Melros*, pp. 669-70.

[2] This was sometimes no elusory reddendo, as spices were costly. In a Brus charter about 1190, however, a pound of pepper was reckoned worth six pennies (ch. 22 below). The sixteenth century Exchequer commutation values are doubtless no criterion, but the list in 1596 included,

"Item for ilk pund of piper, ... xxx s."

(C. Innes, *Scotch Legal Antiquities*, 65).

[3] *Liber de Melros*, 670-71.

[4] Major's *Hist.* i., cap. 5; Camden's *Britannia* (1695), 816.

with the monks of Holme Cultram, under which the latter acquired from the former their saltworks at Rainpatrick, subject to an annual payment of half a mark of silver.[1]

The Cistercians of Melrose and of Holme Cultram appear to have approved of the salters' motto, *Sal sapit omnia*, and almost divided the saltworks on the Solway between themselves and the Benedictines of Wetheral. These last held more than one saltwork on the shore off Burgh by Sands, granted and confirmed by successive charters of the De Morvilles, lords of that place, and their connections.[2] Roland, Lord of Galloway, just mentioned, son of that Uchtred, whose brutal murder by his brother forms so revolting a chapter in Galwegian annals, gave saltworks to both houses. That granted to Melrose[3] was at Preston, in Kirkbean parish, and included pasturage of six cows, six oxen, and one horse, also a toft and croft to make a residence, and right of fuel in the adjoining woods adequate for the supply of the pan (*patella*) of the saltwork. Roland gave also, but for a rent of £10 a year, to the house of Holme Cultram, a saltwork[4] at Lochendello,[5] with rights of wood for the operations, and of pasture for four cattle and 500 pigs. To them, too, he made a grant of another saltwork,[6] where the descending slope of Criffell protracts itself into a flat promontory. It was called the saltwork of Salternes, a name attesting that before the monks got their charter the promontory had its saltwork. The word denoting simply the salters' point, naturally and regularly got worn down to Satterness;[7] but Salterness continued to be

---

[1] *Liber de Melros*, 672-73; *Monasticon* (1846), v. 615.

[2] *Monasticon*, iii. 592. Wetheral also held other saltworks on the west coast of Cumberland (*ib.* 593).

[3] *Liber de Melros*, 54. [4] *Monasticon*, v. 615.

[5] Lochendello can be none other than Lochkindeloch, Lochkindelo, Lochkindelow, or Lochinnedeloche, a barony which at one time gave its name to Newabbey parish, and is thought to be the modern Loch Kinder there (*Reg. Mag. Sig.* v. 1127, year 1586; v. 2146, year 1592; *Retours Kirkcudbright*, 232, 276; *New Statistical Account*, Kirkcudbright (Newabbey parish), 244). [6] *Monasticon*, v. 615,

[7] *Saturness* was one spelling (Kitchin and Barber's map of Kirkcudbrightshire). The tendency of the *l* to disappear is general. Cp. *salt*, *malt*, *fault*; Scottish, *saut*, *maut*, *faut*.

the recognized name[1] even at the end of the eighteenth century. It was reserved for some over-wise person or persons within the last hundred years, giving way, perhaps, to baseless anterior philological fancies,[2] to improve it into Southerness; and authorities on place-names, who ought to have known better, are accessories after the fact.

Yet Satterness still lives vigorously in local pronunciation, especially amongst the older inhabitants of the districts within which it is a household word. It is an invincible witness for the self-explanatory,[3] historical Salterness against the unwarranted upstart at present enthroned in our maps and topographies. Southerness, with its meaningless meaning of southern point[4]—for it is not the southern point even of its own county—threatens to descend to remote posterity in the face of antiquarian protest, and in the very teeth of the parallels of latitude. Is it too late for geographers to entertain an appeal?

20. A Tradition of the Salters.

A thousand traditions, often futile enough in other respects, illustrate the national patriotic fervour of reverence for the memory of King Robert the Bruce. One of these[5] concerns the salters of Annandale. On the farm of Broom, in the parish of Cummertrees, there was a field once known[6] as Bruce's acres. There the king is said to have suffered a defeat at the hands of the English. Skirting the shore of the Solway in his retreat, he came to a house where the inhabitants gave him rye bread, whereupon, with that readiness to baptize places which characterizes monarchs in tradition, he named the place Ryehill, and sure enough Rye-

---

[1] Salterness was the title of both cape and village on it when the *Old Statistical Account* (vol. xv. 127) was written.

[2] The writer of the paper in the *Old Statistical Account* just cited thought Salterness was a corruption of Southwickness.

[3] Compare Salter graunge (*Monasticon*, iii. 579).

[4] Sir Herbert Maxwell's *Galloway Topography* gives this explanation.

[5] *New Statistical Account*, Dumfries (Cummertrees parish), pp. 248-49.

[6] The memory of this field name has now, I believe, been lost, and the exact location is unknown.

hill is still the name it bears. Resuming his journey he next reached Priestside, where a farmer's wife gave him a second repast, this time of bread and eggs. Strange to say, however, there was no salt, for, as the good-wife explained, the people in these parts were not allowed to make it. Bruce thereupon, saith the story, "with his usual generosity, immediately granted to the people in that quarter a charter to make salt, duty free."

Traditions, like eggs, are best taken with an occasional pinch of salt. Ryehill, unfortunately for this one, bore that name[1] before the Bruce was born, and there was no salt duty in Scotland until nearly a century[2] after the Bruce was dead.

21. A Sketch of the History of the Saltworks.

Reminiscences of these saltworks occur in the place-names of the seaboard parishes. Salterness was not a solitary instance. There is a Saltcots on the Blackshaw Merse on the shore of Carlaverock parish. The "Saltcottis" of Ruthwell is a name of very frequent occurrence in the sixteenth and seventeenth century title deeds.[3] One of the saltworks in that parish is supposed to have belonged to some religious body. It formed part of the kirk lands, and was called—perhaps from Our Lady of Melrose—Lady Saltcots,[4] whence Ladyhall, the present name of a farm on the shore. On the English side there are early allusions to more than one saltwork,[5] belonging to the Abbey of Holme Cultram, and situated at the mouths of the Wampol and the Waver. To this day one place bears the

---

[1] Bain's *Cal.* i., No. 1680. The true date of this document I believe to be about 1273; for reasons, see *Scots Lore*, pp. 124-30.

[2] *Exchequer Rolls*, iv., pref. cxxviii. The custom on salt first appears in 1428. The *gabelle* (of salt) in France, although known as a local exaction, was not put upon a national basis till well on in the fourteenth century. Ducange, *gablum*; Cheruel's *Dictionnaire*, *gabelle*.

[3] *Reg. Mag. Sig.* iii. 145, 815; *Acts Parl. Scot.* iv. 665; v. 146.

[4] *Retours Dumfries*, 173, 259.

[5] *Monasticon*, v. 618; "Salinis de Skinburnayse" (*Lib. Quot. Gard.* 123). "Salinis" of course is just Saltcots.

name of Saltcots, which it bore[1] in the time of Edward I. The word "cot" is, in a good many instances here and elsewhere, found associated with saltworks, so that the place name Rabycotes, not far from the last named Saltcots, is probably a memory of the same sort.

Of the history of these saltworks on the Scottish side, not a great deal is known. In 1329 salt from Dumfriesshire went to the pantry of King Robert the Bruce.[2] In 1656, during the Commonwealth, Cromwell imposed a tax of some kind upon the salters, to their violent indignation. By petition,[3] immediately after the Restoration of Charles II., the salters of Annandale made strong protest against this action of the Protector Cromwell. "Inregaird of the painfulness and singularity[4] of the work," it was said on their behalf, they had "ever been frie of any publict imposition or exaction untill the yeer 1656 or therby, that the late Usurper, contrare all reason, equitie, or former practice, forced from them ane exaction, to ther overthrow and ruine, and therby so depauperat them that they are in a starveing condition." By this time it would seem that the salt manufacture had its headquarters in Ruthwell. In the seventeenth century Solway salt, famed for its whiteness and purity, was known[5] as "Ruthwell salt." The petitioners were successful in their application to Parliament, the obnoxious tax was abolished, and when a salt tax was imposed at a later time, this Parliamentary proceeding kept the Annandale salters exempt. Whatever be the exact story of the Annandale exemption from the salt tax, it is distinctly interesting to observe, as I have learned from old inhabitants of the district, that the exemption did not extend to Nithsdale: it stopped on the eastern bank of the Lochar, the very

---

[1] Bain's *Cal.* iv. appx. p. 392. [2] *Exchequer Rolls*, i. 154.

[3] *Acts Parl. Scot.* vii. 367.

[4] It was indeed arduous work—which no doubt is the chief explanation of the servile condition of the labouring salters. Like the colliers, they remained unfree long after all other traces of serfdom had passed away (see Stair's *Institutions*, iv. 45 (17); Bankton (M'Dowall's *Institutes*), 1751, i. p. 68. *Acts Parl. Scot.* vii. 304. 15 George III., ch. 28: and 39 George III., ch. 56).

[5] Blaeu's *Atlas*; account of Annandale: Garioch's MS. in Advocates' Lib., cited in Chalmers's *Caledonia*.

boundary[1] of the territories of the first Robert of Brus, Lord of Annandale, in the twelfth century.

So long as there was a salt tax the salt industry flourished. In Ruthwell it did not die out until after the first decade of the present century, when the abolition of the salt tax all over the country, combining no doubt with better and more plentiful supplies from salt mines, placed the Ruthwell salt-making in the trying position of a long protected pursuit exposed to the ordeal of open and equal competition. So ended the saltworks on the Solway, after an activity of full seven hundred years.

Between Brow-Well and Powfoot, along the merse between the arable land and the bare sand of the Solway, near the scattered farmhouses collectively known as Priestside, there may be seen at intervals holes in the grassy foreshore, from two to three feet deep, a dozen or thereby wide, and six or eight across; the bottom is black, and either dry or half filled with dark and stagnant water. They are the "kinches" or pits once used in the salt manufacture, and are almost the sole remaining local proof that the saltworks once were. The sterile influence of the salt still filtered there a century ago, remains yet, and there is no growth or vegetation in these lifeless holes. They are thus no unfit memorials of a dead industry.

22. Solway Fishings.

Valuable as were the saltworks on the Solway, the salmon fisheries were more valuable still. The suggestions of the charters are unfortunately meagre on the modes by which the fish were taken. Two methods are specified. First there were the sand fishings. One can scarcely doubt that these would be exercised by fixed nets, although the early records leave us without detail as to specialties. On the English side, the fishings appear to have been held on very much the same principle as rights

---

[1] This is deduced from a variety of facts. See Bain's *Cal.* i. 1684 (relative to Locherwood, and naming the Blakebeck, now probably the Blackgrain). The Bruce limit on the east was the county of Cumberland (*National MSS. Scot.* vol. i., No. xix.). The Lochar at its mouth between Ruthwell and Carlaverock still divides ecclesiastical Annandale, the Presbytery of Annan, from Nithsdale, the Presbytery of Dumfries. Cp. *Buccleuch MSS.* (Hist. MSS. Com.), p. 45.

of pasturage, apportioned according to the extent of the ground held by the various owners of land. Thus a grant[1] to the monks of Holme Cultram conveyed to them Thomas de Multon's "full fishery in the water of Eden, pertaining to his freehold in the vill of Burgh, that is, two nets to each carucate of land." An earlier concession[2] was that of "one entire net" at Solleburgh in the same vicinity, made by Hugh de Morville, one of the murderers of Archbishop Thomas à Becket. It carried with it a booth and adequate place for drying the nets. Secondly, there was boat fishing. Allusions are made to such in a charter of fishings, with right "to have and hold a fishing boat with pertinents" at the mouth of the Alne.[3] Another grant to the monks of Holme Cultram of fishings at the mouth of the Wampol, mentions[4] both sea and sand fishery (*piscariis maritimis et sablonibus*). About 1190 Ivo, the founder of the Kirkpatrick family, held a fishery "between the fishery of Blawad and the water of Hesch." Blawad, no doubt one of the *wads* or *waths* of the narrow estuary, was near Torduff Point, its more recent name being Blawatwood or Blaatwood. The Hesch of course was the Esk. Ivo's rights included a place to stretch his nets on, and the annual rent charge due by him was a pound of pepper, or six pennies.[5] When William de Brus, between 1191 and 1215, gave to the Abbey of Melrose a fishery beside Redkirk Point, he expressly empowered the grantees[6] "to practise whatever kind of fishing they shall choose."[7]

---

[1] *Monasticon*, v. 608. [2] *Monasticon*, v. 607. [3] *Monasticon*, v. 610.

[4] *Monasticon*, v. 604. [5] *Buccleuch MSS.*, p. 39. [6] *Liber de Melros*, 668.

[7] Angling is, of course, mentioned only with reference to river fishing. "Nec hamo neque reti nec aliquo modo piscandi" is the phrase of a prohibition (*Monasticon*, iii. 588). As described last century, there were four chief kinds of salmon fishing on the Scottish side of the Solway: (1) by *leisters* or *shauling*, (2) by *haaving* or *hauling*, (3) by pock nets, and (4) by *raise nets* or *lake* fishing (*Old Statistical Account* (Dornock), ii. 15-17). The last was not known at Newabbey (ii. 133). Raisnet is the spelling in *Reg. Mag. Sig.* (1564), iv. 1537. Bownets and paidle nets are also names of fixed engines. Whammle nets, worked from boats, have long been in use on the English side. From an early time the best places for the fixed nets have been recognized as being in the vicinity of the "scars." Sixteenth century charters particularized "le skaris et cowpeis de Cummertreis inter torrentem lie Meirbeck de Newbie currentem in Sulway et lie Brewing skare . . .

The monks of Holme Cultram, chief owners of the saltworks, were also chief owners of the salmon fishings in the estuary—a pleasant suggestion of the industrial and commercial side of the monastic system. In addition to various fishings held by them in England, they had at least four in Scotland. Two of them were in Galloway, one apparently in the vicinity of Southwick,[1] the other on the Nith (Nud or Nyd) at Kirkconnell.[2] Other two were in Annandale—the first at Torduff (anciently Horduf) in Dornock[3] parish, and the second at Rainpatrick,[4] the latter being the one originally granted to the house of Melrose, from which it was transferred in fee-farm to the English abbey.

One feature of fishing grants in Cumberland merits the attention of legal antiquaries. Although gifts to religious houses at times took the form of a stated number of fish—for example, fourteen salmon or six salmon[5]—from the annual catch in inland river fishings; and although, of course, there were tithes of fish; yet there is in some charters a reservation, which seems to be a feudal rent, in the noteworthy form of the "eighth fish" from the basket.[6] This does not occur in the Solway fishing bequests.[7]

---

comprehend. Hallgarthskar, Litillhallskar, Duchallskar, Powskar, Newskar, et Waitskar cum ceteris lie skarris drauchtis haldis laikis et nettis" (*Reg. Mag. Sig.* (1607), vi. 1847). "Cowpeis" appears as "culpis" in 1516 (*Buccleuch MSS.*, p. 50).

[1] *Monasticon*, v. 615. It was between Polben and Sivchaye (*sic*), which last I take to be Suthayc. Suthayk is a better known form of spelling (see Bain's *Cal.* ii., index). Compare Sutheayt (Bain's *Cal.* i., p. 548).

[2] *Monasticon*, v. 616. It extended from the outfall of the rivulet of Kirkconnell into the Nyd as far as Pollesterheved (Polle-scer-heved, Pow-scar-head?). This is probably the end of the scar opposite the mouth of the Newabbey Pow.

[3] Bain's *Cal.* i. 607.

[4] *Liber de Melros*, 672-73; *Monasticon*, v. 615.

[5] *Monasticon*, iii. 578.

[6] "Octavum vero piscem quem ipse et antecessores sui de coffino monachorum habere solebant in manu sua retinuit" (*Monasticon*, iii. 588). Compare other examples, iii. 588, 589.

[7] The Bishop of Glasgow had an eighth of the royal profits from the issues of the criminal courts in the Glasgow diocese (*Registrum Glasguensis Episcopatus*, Nos. 10, 24; *Exchequer Rolls*, i., p. lviii.). A tenth was usual in other places.

The early grants by the lords of Annandale have an interesting reservation. The sturgeon, now distinctively a royal fish, was reserved from the fishings.[1] Another reservation, long specifically royal, was that of the great fish *grossus piscis* or *le graspes*. Writers on old English law[2] claim the whale, like the sturgeon, as a royal fish, but with a difference. The king was entitled to the whole sturgeon if he demanded it, but a whale fell to be divided, the head going to the king himself, while the tail was a perquisite of the queen. One reason assigned for this strange apportionment was that it was designed to furnish the queen's wardrobe with whalebone—a very unfortunate reason when it is remembered that the head was the king's share. Old Scots law also provides, though differently, for the case of "a quhail fundyn on the see cost."[3] It was, according to charter, apparently a royal escheat, of which the kings made liberal grants to the church. David I. gave teind of it to Holyrood Abbey. Malcolm IV., confirmed by William the Lion, Alexander II., and Alexander III., gave and granted to the monks of Dunfermline the whole head of every whale stranded or captured, except its tongue. By a dubious fragment of old Scots legislation, the right to the escheat depended on the weight of the fish. If it did not break down a six-ox cart before it was out of high-tide-mark, it might fall to the adjacent landholder; otherwise it was the king's. There were thus eccentricities in Scotland too.

V. WARS OF EDWARD I.: 1296 TO 1307.

23. Campaigns of 1296, 1297, and 1298.

From the outbreak of the War of Independence until the Union of the Crowns, the Solway played so large a part in Border history that there

---

[1] *Liber de Melros*, 668; Bain's *Cal.* i. 607.

[2] Bracton, fo. 120*b*; Fleta, 61; Prynne's *Aur. Reg.* 127; Blackstone, i., ch. 4; De Gray Birch's *Domesday Book*, 175; Madox's *Exchequer* (1711), 349, 381; *Reg. Palat. Dunelm.* (*R.S.*), iii. 49.

[3] *Acts Parl. Scot.* i. 358, 364, 386, 407, 427, 748.

was some fitness in the circumstance that there the first overt act of warfare took place. On 26th March, 1296, the Scots, forestalling by two days Edward I.'s invasion of Scotland on the east march, entered England at Solway. A contemporary[1] states that they crossed the "water of Sulewath" at three places, which are not further specified. Their futile attack on Carlisle was sternly revenged at Berwick, which Edward stormed on 30th March, with terrible slaughter of men, women, and children.

King John Balliol's career, brief and inglorious, ended in his abject renunciation to Edward I. of the crown which Edward had adjudged him. The Ragman Rolls were sealed by the Scottish barons, and it seemed as if the last day of Scottish independence had passed. But Wallace roused the drooping spirit of the land. Blind Harry,[2] in his poem, makes his hero dream in the little church of Monkton of an interview with St. Andrew, and of seeing

> "a felloune fyr,
> Quhilk braithly brent on breid throu all the land—
> Scotland atour fra Ross to Sulway sand."

During the momentous patriotic struggle of 1297, there are scarcely any allusions to the Solway. In the apocryphal battle of Biggar, Blind Harry makes Edward I. retreat through Annandale, telling that he

> "At the Birkhill a litill tary maid,
> Syne throuch the land, but rest, our Sulway raid."[3]

And, again, he tells (and here his account is probably not quite so far from the actual) how Wallace drove the English before him out of Sanquhar and other Nithsdale strongholds, and how, aided by Corries and Kirkpatricks, Johnstones and Hallidays, he pressed on them till they turned to bay by the sea shore.

> "For Maxwell[4] als out off Carlaverok com;
> On to the Sotheroun, the gaynest way is nom;

---

[1] Hemingburgh, ii. 95.

[2] *Wallace*, vii. 86. Blind Harry's imaginative story seems to deserve quotation for the sake of his specific references to the Solway itself.

[3] *Wallace*, vi. 761; but = without, our = over.

[4] *Wallace*, ix. 1811; gaynest = most direct, nom = taken, feyll = many.

In to the chass so wysly thai rid;
Few gat away that com apon that sid.
Besyd Cokpull[1] full feyll fechtand they fand,
Sum drownyt was, som slayn upon the sand."

English chronicle does not allow to Scotland all the glories of the time. In 1297, about Christmas time,[2] Sir Robert Clifford, with a large force, crossed the "water of Sulewath," whereupon a trumpet proclaimed to the troops that they were free to pillage on their own behalf—a permission which, the historians rather unnecessarily assure us, gave great satisfaction. This expedition was signalized by the battle of Annan Moor.[3] In the following year, preparatory to the campaign distinguished by the complete overthrow of Wallace in the battle of Falkirk, King Edward possibly designed to invade Scotland on the west, though ultimately he did so on the east. An assembly of Welsh troops, fixed first for the 17th and afterwards for the 25th of June, 1298, was ordered to be made at Carlisle,[4] where also certain stores, chiefly from Ireland, were directed to be delivered by sea and land as quickly as possible.[5] Corresponding precepts were issued for consignments of provisions to Berwick.[6] But most of these writs were not out until April; the army was on the march in June, and the commissariat system broke down. The resulting embarrassment was very clearly reflected in Edward's letters of remonstrance.[7] In the end the trouble became so acute that the sequel of his victory at Falkirk was an enforced retreat.[8] The stores at Carlisle may have had something to do with his returning by the west march, through Annandale. Blind Harry,[9] with substantial truth, tells us:

---

[1] Cockpool is nowhere on record known to me so early as 1297 (see note to ch. 26 below).

[2] Hemingburgh, ii. 146; Knighton in *Decem. Scrip.* 2522; Trivet, *Eng. Hist. Soc.* 368.

[3] See my *Old Annan*, p. 8; also *Caudatus Anglicus*, p. 12; *Proceedings Dumfries Antiq. Soc.*, 1894-95, p. 159; *Transactions Glasgow Archæological Soc.*, new series, ii. 452.

[4] Bain, ii. 984; Gough (*Scotland in 1298*), 90, 107-112.

[5] Gough, 5, 83, 98-100, 107.

[6] Gough, 99, 121-22.

[7] Gough, 125-26.

[8] Hemingburgh, ii. 180; Gough, introd. xiii., xxx.

[9] *Wallace*, x. 738.

"In raid battail the King to Sulway raid,
With mekill payn, fast upon Ingland cost."

Contemporary historians[1] are all agreed that he passed from Lochmaben to Carlisle, and although not one of them names the exact line of his journey, there need be little doubt that Harry is right, and that Edward on that occasion first saw and crossed the ford, which he was destined seldom to see except under circumstances of vexation. To him it proved, from first to last, a symbol of disappointed hopes.

24. Preparations of 1299.

A campaign annually in 1296, 1297, and 1298: Scotland as far as ever from being conquered: yet one more expedition necessary in 1299—such was the situation King Edward had to face. He had gained little by the labours of 1298 in spite of his victory over Wallace. Stirling in 1299 was *in extremis*; and the sphere of the English dominance was closely restricted to the vicinity of the fortresses manned. Dumfries and Lochmaben were amongst the minor castles thus held. The latter, a place of no great strength, had in the winter of 1298 been fortified by a peel—a woodwork around the castle. Notwithstanding, the garrison stood in perilous case. The hostages of Galloway who were dying, or had already died, in the dungeons of Carlisle had not secured the allegiance of the south-west. Provisions about Lochmaben were scarce, the castle was subject to incessant attacks, and in the south as in the north the achievements of conquest were in acute danger of loss. Dumfries Castle was victualled from the sea and the Nith, John le Skirmysshur's galley[2] and crew being employed for that end.

The events of 1298 had shown that a Scottish campaign could not be made self-supporting in the smallest degree. This accounts for a new development of the war policy pursued. Already in the following year,

---

[1] The passages from them all are collected in Gough, introd. xv.-xxxii.

[2] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 1133. John and his galley of twenty-six oars hailed from Winchelsea (*Lib. Quot. Gard.* 272).

1299, along the whole coast of Cumberland, at Workington, Allonby, Silloth, and Skinburness, there is mention[1] of shipping with provisions in large quantities, wheat, oats, malt, wine, flour, and salt meat, pork and fish, on the way towards Lochmaben. Several wrecks are recorded, one of the "Holy Cross" of Lyme, laden with wine, which was saved from the wreck at Silloth (Selathe) in August. The provisions were conveyed by water across the firth to Annan and forwarded thence by wagons and horses to Lochmaben.

That these extensive stores were consigned to the northern shores of Cumberland for purposes more important than merely providing the larder of Lochmaben is evident, because in September the writs[2] had been issued for a levy of troops for a projected Scottish war, mustering at Newcastle in November. Subsequently the rendezvous was fixed for Berwick in December.[3] But the English nobles were at variance with the king about the non-observance of the Great Charter, which he had confirmed: they refused to advance,[4] and Stirling was surrendered to the Scots.

In the depth of this mortification Edward's unconquerable energy appeared. Already he was laying his plans for a campaign in the ensuing summer. He ordained an assembly of troops at Carlisle in June, 1300. He would then "by the help of God," he said,[5] "sternly and strongly repress the rebellion, perfidy, and iniquity of the Scots." Requisitions[6] were issued in January for the supply and despatch of 7,000 quarters of wheat, 10,000 quarters of oats, 4,000 quarters of malt, and 10,000 dry fish. These varied stores, from different parts of England and Ireland, were to reach "the port of Skynburnesse" by John the Baptist's day, 24th June, 1300. Obviously, in 1300, Edward I. did not mean to repeat the mistake of 1298. He had taken time by the forelock in a manner calculated to quicken one's interest, for at least one twelvemonth of history, in the port of Skinburness. It was to furnish a special illustration of what the early chroniclers styled a "ship force" co-operating with a "land force."

---

[1] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 1115. [2] Bain, ii. 1092. [3] Bain, ii. 1111.
[4] Hemingburgh, ii. 186. [5] *Northern Registers*, 138. [6] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 1128.

25. The Port of Skinburness.

A couple of miles along the shore north from Silloth there is a cluster of houses on the neck of the narrow peninsula which ends in the Grune Point. Skinburness, as the hamlet is called, has to the east an expanse of marsh washed on the north-east by the embouchure of the Wampol and the Waver. Outside the peninsula the action of the sea is known to have been destructive and encroaching; inside the bay there can be but little doubt that the same forces are at work as at Rockcliffe, and that the land is creeping down into the sea. The handful of white houses is not without a certain sleepy picturesqueness, but there is no stir about the place, which may strike an uninitiated eye with an effect of dull flatness like that of the marsh on which it looks. Time has dealt hardly with Skinburness. It was not always a mere fragment of a village sitting upon a lonely shore. Once, when Silloth was only a farm-building, a sea-lath,[1] a grange or barn[2] by the sea (the name in its primitive spelling of Se-lathe implies this),[3] Skinburness was a seaport and chartered burgh, with fairs and markets and a considerable trade. But the sea made inroads, represented in the year 1304, probably with exaggerations, to have been of so serious a character that the town and the road leading to it were carried away.[4] Skinburness and Silloth have changed places. Skinburness and its harbour are forgotten and the barn by the sea has become the modern Silloth, a thriving port and town. In 1300, however, Skinburness was in its heyday.

It had no small share in the equipment of the English army. Many ships were there laden with provisions of every kind. The place became

---

[1] Sea-lath, perhaps to contradistinguish it from another lath not far distant on the Wampol. See Camden's *Britannia* (1695), map of Cumberland.

[2] Lath is a word used in Cumberland for a barn, from Norse *hlada*, a barn. R. Ferguson's *Northmen in Cumberland and Westmorland*, p. 105.

[3] What completes the proof of the etymology is that the possessions of Holme Cultram Abbey in 26 Henry VIII. included "unam grangiam vocatam Selaythe" (Dugdale's *Monasticon* (1846), v. 618).

[4] *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, i. 161: "Et nunc villa illa simul cum itinere ducente versus eandem asportata per mare." See also *Lib. Quot. Gard.*, 126.

a visible assurance that in 1300 Edward and his army were not going to be starved into retreat. The little port was moved with an unwonted activity. It possessed unrivalled advantages as an emporium for provisions and warlike stores: it was the northmost and most convenient harbour of western England. It had already been utilised as a receiving depot for military stores. Now it was to become, for the time, a busy naval station and a place of arms, whilst, on the other side of the firth, an Admiral of the Fleet was in command of the redoubtable navy of England, afloat for the first time in Scottish waters.

26. The Siege of Carlaverock, A.D. 1300.

The troops of Edward I. summoned to meet him at Carlisle on 24th June marched for Scotland (probably crossing Solway) about 1st July. The army numbered upwards of 6000. It passed up Annandale to Dumfries, and thence went on to Carlaverock Castle,[1] which, to the chagrin and surprise of Edward, refused to surrender, although the garrison consisted of no more than 60 men. Projectile engines had to be sent for. Friar Robert of Ulm was the king's engineer.[2] Two engines[3]—if not more, one of them called Robinet[4]—were brought from Lochmaben. Others were, on 10th July, conveyed from Skinburness to Carlaverock on board the "St. George" of Dartmouth and another vessel,[5] the former sustaining considerable damage to her cordage in consequence.

The interesting heraldic poem known as the *Roll of Caerlaverock* incidentally describes the coming of these ships[6] as very opportune, stating that soon after the arrival of the army at the castle it had happened well

---

[1] Reached perhaps on the 9th. *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 202.

[2] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 257.

[3] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 258, 267.

[4] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 65.

[5] *Lib. Quot Gard.* 70, 272, 274.

[6] *Roll of Caerlaverock*, p. 27. A small portion of the fleet had sailed from Bridgewater on 24th May (*Lib. Quot. Gard.* 275), and was paid for services at Carlaverock (*Lib. Quot. Gard.* 272). The rest of the fleet may have been there too, but the Wardrobe Accounts are rather indefinite.

"That the navy[1] came to land
With the engines and the victuals."

Soon Robinet and the other great catapults were got into position. But for them[2] and three others made by the friar-engineer it is plain that the assault on the castle would have been futile. The *Roll of Caerlaverock* eulogizes the energy of the king's master engineer:

"Friar Robert who threw there
Many a stone from Robinet."

After a stout defence extending over several days, the much battered castle was surrendered.

King Edward next proceeded into Galloway, striking overland on his route, and reaching the sea at Kirkcudbright on 19th July. Four days afterwards his fleet arrived.

27. The English Fleet in Scotland.

On 20th June, 1300, the fleet had set sail from Winchelsea.[3] The *Roll of Caerlaverock* records the satisfaction which the arrival of the ships caused during the siege. Whether this was the entire fleet or not, certain it is that the fleet as a whole came to land at Kirkcudbright on 23rd July. There were thirty principal ships and almost as many smaller craft, making at the seaward end of the Solway Firth a very real display of English maritime power. The fleet thus assembled was under the command of Gervase Alard of Winchelsea, a name not unknown[4] in the English annals of the sea. He bore the title of Admiral of the Fleet[5]—"admiral," a name borrowed from the East and still quite new in England; indeed, not used there[6] before 1295. The strength of the fleet lay in thirty ships furnished by

---

[1] Probably some of the larger ships were moored at the mouth of Lochar. Hence perhaps the name of Cokpule (Cog-pool?) not heard of till after this date.

[2] *Roll of Caerlaverock*, p. 34.

[3] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 275, 278.

[4] Williams's *Britain's Naval Power*, p. 16.

[5] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 278: "Amerallus flote predicte (*i.e.* quinque portuum)."

[6] Selden Society's *Admiralty Pleas*, vol. i. Mr. Marsden's Introd. p. 12.

the Cinque Ports—a term which by this time, directly or indirectly, embraced not only Hastings, Romney, Hythe, Dover, and Sandwich, but also other five southern seaports, Pevensey, Rye, Winchelsea, Faversham, and Folkestone.[1] The admiral's pay was 2s. per day. Under him were four captains at 1s. Each of the thirty ships had a master, paid 6d. Most of them carried two constables, ranking below the master but receiving the same pay. The ordinary seamen had 3d.

Of the thirty ships, sixteen had each (besides master and two constables) 39 seamen, the respective numbers of these last in the remaining fourteen ships varying from 37 to 19. The whole sea force contributed by the Cinque Ports amounted to 1099 men.[2]

Of the other vessels some were less distinctly naval in their function, and most of them were much smaller than the men of war. The annexed list shows that counting all kinds there were fifty-eight ships, having on board (besides the admiral and four captains) 58 masters, 57 constables, and 1337 sailors—a total of 1455 men.

LIST OF SHIPS[3] IN THE ESTUARY IN 1300.

Ship.	Port.	Masters.	Constables.	Seamen.
Annete,	(?)	1	0	6
Barge,	Carrickfergus,	1	0	7
Blakebat,	Chester,	1	0	7
Boat (batellus),	Man,	1	0	3
La Bredeshipe,	Furneaux,	1		(?)
La Blith,	Hastings,	1	1	19

[1] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 275-78.

[2] One chaplain served to confess them all (*Lib. Quot. Gard.* 276).

[3] The list is made up from the Wardrobe Accounts, the *Liber Quotidianus Garderobae*, chiefly pp. 271-79. One or two other ships are mentioned also—the God's Ship of Hartlepool, the Grace Dieu of Lynn, the Sauve of Lyme, and the Welfare of Brightlingsea. They seem to have been employed on the east coast. In the list all the vessels carrying constables are from the Cinque Ports, with the exception of the two galleys from Bridgewater. The religious cults of shipmen are interestingly represented in the names. The Virgin—the *stella maris*—heads the list with six (Mary and its diminutive, Mariota). Next comes Nicholas with five—another specifically sailor's saint. The national saint is Thomas—he of Canterbury—with three. St. George had not yet become distinctively England's tutelary patron.

Ship.	Port.	Masters.	Constables.	Seamen.
La Blithe,	Hyth,	1	1	19
La Bret,	Hastings,	1	1	19
La Chivaler,	Dover,	1	2	34
La Cristine,	Dover,	1	2	35
Cog,	Dover,	1	2	39
Cog,	Folkestone,	1	1	23
Galley,	Winchelsea,	1	0	26
2 *Galleys*,[1]	Bridgewater,	2	3	95
Grace Dieu,	Ross,	1	0	7
La Godelyne,	Romney,	1	2	39
La Godyere,	(?)	1	0	4
La Godyere,	Dublin,	1	0	17
La Godyere,	Rye,	1	2	39
La Godyn,[2]	Dover,	1	2	34
Grace Dieu,	Ross,	1	0	7
Holy Spirit ship,	Sandwich,	1	2	39
Holy Spirit barge,	Sandwich,	1	0	35
Holy Rood ship,	Hyth,	1	2	39
La Mabely,	Dover,	1	2	34
La Malyne,	Dover,	1	2	33
La Margarete,	"Kihavene,"	1	0	12
La Mariote,	Drogheda,	1	0	5
La Mariote,	Eselwell,	1	0	6
La Mariote,	Workington,	1	0	6
La Mariote,	Whitehaugh,	1	0	5
La Mariote,	Whitehaugh,	1	0	3
Naucharge,	(?)	1	0	8
La Nicholas,	Faversham,	1	2	37
La Nicholas,	Geyton,	1	0	5
La Nicholas,	Hyth,	1	1	19
La Nicholas,	Pevensey,	1	2	39
Nicholas,	(?)	1	0	6
La Riche,	Romney,	1	2	39
La Rose,	Dover,	1	2	32
La Rose,	Rye,	1	2	39
St. Edmund ship,	Dover,	1	2	34
St. Edward cog,	Winchelsea,	1	2	39
St. George ship,	Dartmouth,	1	0	8
St. Giles cog,	Winchelsea,	1	2	39
St. Mary cog,	Winchelsea,	1	2	39

[1] One of them once is called a barge.

[2] William Godyn, master.

Ship.	Port.	Masters.	Constables.	Seamen.
St. Thomas cog,	Winchelsea,	1	2	39
St. Thomas cog,	Sandwich,	1	2	39
La Sauve,	Lyme,	1	0	15
La Sauveye,	Sandwich,	1	2	39
La Sauveye,	Teignmouth,	1	0	9
Sauveye,	Allonby,	1	0	3
Ship, unnamed,	(?)	1	0	10
L'Snak,	Rye,	1	2	39
L'Snak of St. Thomas,	Winchelsea,	1	2	39
Strethtaile,	Dublin,	1	0	7
La Waynepayn,	Hyth,	1	1	19

These vessels were variously employed, although their special functions are only incidentally named. Scarcely anything is said of the work performed by the warships of the Cinque Ports. Perhaps this is because it was not paid for, being, for the chief part of the campaign, the service due to the Crown.[1] One entry in the accounts tells of the construction by the Admiral of a *hurdicium* of woodwork on the small boat of the St. Edward cog of Winchelsea.[2] This is believed to have been a protective shield, making an armour-clad vessel. Whilst the siege was in progress, Malcolm le fiz le Engleys had safe conduct[3] with his galleys to harass the Scots.

The transit work was wholly performed by the other vessels, which, by their smaller size and burden, were no doubt better adapted for a coast whose sandy strands and rapidly flowing and ebbing and far receding tides made navigation by bigger ships so full of dangers. An allowance of 20s. was made to each master of the Cinque Ports' ships for lodmannage[4] or pilot dues.

The chief business of the transport ships was the carriage of provisions[5] to places suited to the army's march. One ship brought horses from Ireland.[6] Wheat was sometimes despatched from the Scottish side to

---

[1] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 275.

[2] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 72.

[3] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 1154.

[4] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 276.

[5] *Lib. Quot. Gard. passim;* see pp. 69, 70, 83, 119, 120, 123, 271, 272-274.

[6] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 83.

Dublin, Whitehaven, or Workington to be ground, returning thence as flour.[1] All through Skinburness appears as the base of supplies. The stores collected there were being augmented, purchases from Irish merchants[2] being conspicuous. Besides these matters of transport there was much coming and going of messengers. One of these was delayed for a time at Skinburness waiting for a fair wind.[3]

The army continued its progress westward as far as the Cree, but never got within fighting distance of the Scots. Amongst the few casualties recorded was the capture of King Edward's cook.[4]

About the middle of August the English army began its retreat. On the 23rd the king had reached Sweetheart Abbey.[5] He stayed there, with the army encamped near by, over the 24th and 25th. His itinerary is not complete from the 25th until the 29th, when he was at Carlaverock again—a hiatus leaving some faint doubt about the locality of a deeply important episode of this campaign.

Throughout all these movements the line of march was never very far from the coast and the ships kept close touch with the army, communication being established[6] at Kirkcudbright, on the water of Fleet, and on the Cree, as well as at Sweetheart Abbey and Carlaverock.

There is in the events of this period one significant allusion to the conveyance of stores across the estuary by the old ford. Victuals, in course of being taken with two carts and seven horses to Lochmaben, were carried off[7] by the Scots "in the passage at Sulwath." The incident is typical of the guerilla warfare pursued by the Scottish army.

28. Pope, Archbishop, and King.

Whilst Edward I. lay at Sweetheart Abbey a very distinguished personage was, with no little impatience, waiting for an opportunity to cross the firth

[1] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 273, 274.

[2] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 125, 126, 127.

[3] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 69.

[4] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 168. The tactics of the Scots are well stated in Langtoft (*R.S.*), ii. 324.

[5] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 202, 69, 97.

[6] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 273, 274, 69.

[7] "In abduccione per Scotos in transitu apud Sulwath" (*Lib. Quot. Gard.* 129); see Bain's *Cal.* ii. 1116, where this entry is dated November (?), 1299.

to him. It was no ordinary business that had brought Robert of Winchelsea, Archbishop of Canterbury, to these northern latitudes. Perhaps the ablest prelate who had ever filled the See, he had gradually drifted into opposition to the king, an attitude which became pronounced when, in 1297, he had leagued with the barons in insisting upon a confirmation of the charters. The relations between the monarch and the primate were distant and unfriendly, and one can well believe that the archbishop was by no means enamoured of the particular business he now had in hand. But he was acting on the strict personal injunction of Pope Boniface VIII., that aggressive and high-handed pontiff, whom a chronicler pithily characterized as one whom the whole world dreaded as it dreaded a lion.[1] The temporal power and ambition of the papacy were at their height. Claims of sovereignty and civil authority were being pushed to extremes which now make one marvel at the forbearance of Christendom in face of such pretensions. At this time the Scots had besought the pope's influence in resisting their oppression by the English king. He complied so far with their prayers by demanding an immediate recall of the Edwardian occupation, putting in at the same time a powerful stroke for himself as pope by the preposterous allegation that Scotland had, from ancient times, belonged to the Apostolic See.

A bull[2] with this extraordinary claim, written by Boniface to Edward I., was transmitted to the archbishop for the purpose of being personally executed by delivery into the king's own hand. Promptly the archbishop made ready for his northern journey. Travelling with all haste he arrived in Carlisle soon after the fall of Carlaverock Castle, and after Edward had marched into Galloway.

Unable for various reasons to get near the king, the archbishop sent two of his household "by ship across certain perilous passages of the sea," mentioning the letter of which he was the bearer, and requesting

---

[1] *Chron. Lanercost*, 202.

[2] This bull and the letters of the archbishop regarding its execution appear in the *Flores Historiarum*, also in the *Chronicles of Edward I. and II.* (*R.S.*), under the years 1300 and 1301.

the king's directions as to the safest way to reach him. One can well conceive that the king had no pleasant expectations from the pope's letter, and was not greatly concerned at the possibility of its delivery being indefinitely postponed. His reply was admirably diplomatic. He told the messengers that there was no ship available, and that his grace's best and safest course was to go to Berwick, where the queen was, and where he himself proposed to meet her. The suggestion is not without a drily sarcastic touch. Edward was in no hurry for the pope's bull, and the archbishop was welcome to go to Berwick, which, by the way, the archbishop's letter spells Gerewicas. Possibly it would do no injustice to the real feeling of Edward's heart if his words were rendered in the modern idiom as a mild suggestion to the archbishop to go to Jericho!

Although his grace might be personally no hero, he was scarcely a coward. Serve the bull he must at whatever hazard, and he waited in no small discomfort on the borders for nearly six weeks, biding his time for a chance of safely reaching the king. King Edward's messenger, who tarried at Skinburness for a fair wind, seemingly got one at last, but no such wind came for the archbishop. He had to make his own opportunity. His own account of it is very striking.

"At length," he says, "having by diligent enquiry heard that the king in returning with his army towards the Castle of Carlaverock (which he had taken before) in Scotland, had pitched his tents near the new abbey of Sweetheart (Duzquer) in Galloway, and being willing to expose myself, my men, and my goods to danger rather than thus to dally in such remote, and in a manner desert, parts beyond my diocese and province, I kept myself concealed in certain secret places near the sea which separates England and Galloway, and took advantage of an opportunity at ebb tide. Guided by some who were bound not to be ignorant of the direction of the crossing, I passed with my horses and harness through four streams of water in the sea, not more dangerous because of the depth of water than because of the ins and outs of the shore and the quicksands. Thus almost beyond expectation, on Friday [26th August] next after the feast of St. Bartholomew the Apostle now last past, I came to the king, then amidst his army and at dinner. And because he had not time, as he said,

that day, he sent word to me that evening by two of his chief earls who were then aiding him, that on the morrow, viz. Saturday, he would graciously hear me."

Evidently the reception accorded was in no sense a welcome after the long, fatiguing, dangerous, and strange journey across the fords and along the sands of the Solway Firth—for the first, and probably the last time in history, undertaken by an Archbishop of Canterbury. As regards the place where he found the king, the uncertainty of Edward's itinerary between 25th and 29th August leaves some slight uncertainty, but the probabilities are very strong indeed for the accuracy of an ancient docquet on the bull that it was at Carlaverock.[1]

On the morrow, accordingly, the archbishop was received in state by King Edward, Prince Edward, and all the magnates present in the army. The bull was publicly read. The gravity of the situation which it announced was of course immense. The war was expressly declared to be in contempt of the Holy See. To defy the pope—especially such a pope as Boniface, when the situation of matters on the continent was so threatening—was to run risks too serious. Edward, although resolved to withstand the pope's claim to the uttermost, did not defy him. After hearing what the archbishop had to say urging obedience to the papal behest, the king caused a speech to be made in his name, declaring that, in accordance with the custom of England, he would consult his parliament before making reply.

29. The Retreat.

It is not impossible to conceive that Edward's original plan of campaign in Scotland had been modified before he knew of the arrival of the papal bull. There are indications that he had had it in view to march northward from the Cree. At all events, the fact that he had ordered ships to carry stores to Ayr points in that direction.[2] The return eastward

---

[1] "Apud Carlav'oks in Scotia" (Prynne's *History of John, Henry III., and Edward I.*, 1670, p. 883).

[2] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 68.

from the Cree savours of a possible change of purpose, although even after that there are signs that the design to advance was not abandoned. The policy of the Scots deliberately to avoid engagements made the campaign trying. When the enemy persistently refused to fight, the large army was almost as useless as the fleet.

It is not unlikely that other motives besides the bull of Boniface influenced Edward's action. Be that as it may, he decided at once to content himself meantime with what he had, and to march his army back to England as fast as possible. On the 27th he had received the archbishop with the papal letter; on the 29th he was still at Carlaverock;[1] but on the 30th and 31st he was at Dornock,[2] waiting to cross with the troops; and on 1st September he and his army were at Drumburgh, on the Cumberland side of the firth,[3] which they must have crossed by the Dornock ford. The army was already being disbanded. The archbishop, who had retired so soon as his mission was performed,[4] truthfully assured the pope that Edward and his army had returned to England within four days, and that the troops had been disbanded forthwith. He may have left the pope to infer that this was in obedience to the apostolic threats, but he did not say so in terms. A considerable portion of the army had ceased to appear on the pay sheets on 25th August before the archbishop arrived; other bodies were dismissed at Drumburgh. The fleet remained in the estuary until 20th September,[5] when it set sail for home. Singularly enough the admiral did not sail, but rode home to Winchelsea. The king gave him a black horse for the purpose.[6]

As King Edward rode away from the shore, did he recall to mind his vow to repress the rebellion, the perfidy, and the iniquity of the Scots? He must have felt that arrears were accumulating.

After a sojourn at Carlisle, the Rose Castle, and Holme Cultram, he was back in Scotland in October and November erecting a peel or fortified

---

[1] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 68.

[2] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 172, 165.

[3] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 172, 126.

[4] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 195-97, 202.

[5] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 277.

[6] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 166.

enceinte of wood around Dumfries Castle.[1] Part of the timber for the purpose had been floated across the estuary and up the Nith.[2] One of the engines from Lochmaben, employed in the siege of Carlaverock, was at this time shipped to Skinburness to be repaired.[3] The truce entered into between the English and Scots, at the instance of King Philip of France, was published at Dumfries,[4] when Edward was there on 30th October, to last until Whitsunday, 1301.

30. Last Years of Edward I.

Edward had now discovered that the east coast was geographically much the easier and more convenient way into Scotland. Berwick was far closer to the heart of the land, and the eastern route lay through opener country. The king of England did not see the Solway estuary again, after leaving it in November, 1300, for more than six years, although he spent much time in the north during the end of 1301, the beginning of 1302, and the greater part of 1303 and 1304. In 1301 it was his design, whilst he entered on the east, that his son should have the honours of "taming the Scots" on the west. The young prince, afterwards Edward II., gained no laurels by the expedition. He was in Dumfries in July; in September he made pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Ninian at Whithorn.

From 1301 until 1306 there is repeated mention of Skinburness forming as before a base of supplies and transport by sea.[5] We hear of ships at Kirkcudbright also.[6]

The capture and execution of Wallace in 1305 seemingly completed the subjugation of Scotland—seemingly, for about six months. Scottish independence was a hydra with too many heads for Edward I. who, in February, 1306, found himself confronted with a worse state of affairs than ever. The slaying of Sir John Comyn and the revolt and coronation of

---

[1] See my *Peel*, p. 3; *Glasgow Arch. Soc. Transac.*, new series, vol. ii., p. 123.

[2] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 268.

[3] *Lib. Quot. Gard.* 267.

[4] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 1163.

[5] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 1193, 1260, 1369-72, 1377; iv. p. 392.

[6] Bain's *Cal.* iv., p. 450.

Bruce were followed by efforts of feverish energy to suppress the "ryote" of the Scots.[1] Skinburness again became a busy shipping depot for stores and munitions.[2] In the winter months of 1306 Bruce was in hiding on Rachrin (Rathlin) Isle off the Irish coast. In the spring he returned. In February, 1307, orders were issued[3] to the Cumberland ports, Workington, Whitehaven, and Skinburness, to fit out and despatch towards Ayr ships in pursuit of the aggressive fugitive—to search for and to arrest him and his abettors. The old king, ill content and impatient[4] with his lieutenants, was progressing slowly northward. He had lain five months at Lanercost waiting for that return of health which never came. Scottish news continued to give little satisfaction, and in March he moved on from Lanercost to prosecute the war against the rebel Bruce—"King Hobbe," as in a moment of contemptuous anger he styled[5] him. Arrangements were pushed on for the coming campaign. The estuary and its tributaries—the waters round about Carlisle—were to furnish thirteen boats, each to carry thirteen men at arms. These vessels were to be sufficiently provided with timber to "hurd" them well[6]—an order which will remind us of the *hurdicium* on the boat of the "St.-Edward-cog" in the campaign of 1300. All this was to be done against the king's arrival at Carlisle, which he reached in March. A muster of troops was levied[7] for the middle of April. On Whitsunday there was a grand march-past of 400 of his cavalry decked with leaves.[8] The old indomitable spirit still flamed in the worn-out warrior's breast; but his dysentery was no better; he had come to Carlisle a doomed man, and on 3rd July, when he set off on his last march carried on a horse litter by stages of two miles a day, the end was close at hand. In Carlisle the rumour had risen that he was already dead,[9] and historians tell that that was one reason why he nerved himself to move forward once again. So

---

[1] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 1825.

[2] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 1763, 1769, 1796, 1808, 1821, 1924, 1940, 1979.

[3] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 1893.

[4] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 1896.

[5] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 1979. *National MSS. Scot.*, part ii., pl. xiii.

[6] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 1821.

[7] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 1913.

[8] Bain's *Cal.* ii. 1979.

[9] Hemingburgh, ii. 266.

feeble was he that on the fourth day, when he rested at Burgh by Sands,[1] he had travelled just six miles.

The contemporary[2] evidence is clear that his objective was Scotland. Another version that he was heading for Holme Cultram in quest of better air[3] is negatived completely by the position of the monument first raised in 1685 on the site of the heap of great stones[4] which marked the spot where last he pitched his tent. It is quite off the road to Holme Cultram: it is on the road for the north. Since he had last crossed the Solway there had been strange changes in the world. Pope Boniface VIII., whose imperious mandate had come to him in these parts, was dead, mortally humiliated by King Philip le Bel. As a so-called prophecy declared would happen, he had climbed up (into St. Peter's chair) like a fox, had ruled like a lion, and had perished like a dog. The Archbishop of Canterbury, who had been the trusted emissary of one pope, had been suspended by another, and was now an exiled suppliant for restoration to his see. The great and stern Plantagenet's own turn had come now. Daybreak on 7th July, 1307, found him in camp on the shore north of Burgh by Sands. The road for Scotland lay in front across the fords—the Stonywath, hard by, over the Eden; and the Sulwath, two miles distant, over the Esk. As his attendants were in the act of raising him to give him food he collapsed in their hands, and the mighty spirit passed away. His death simplified the problem of Scottish independence. Bruce, if we may trust a London annalist of the year 1308, had early taken the measure of the new monarch. In the gossip of the English capital it ran that Bruce had expressed himself as dreading more the dead father's bones than he did the living son. It were more glory, he had said also, to win half a foot of land from Edward the First than to wrest a kingdom from Edward the Second.

---

[1] In Barbour's *Bruce*, iv. lines 188-205, by a geographical lapse rare in that poem, "Bowrch-in-the-Sand" is located in Northumberland.

[2] *Flores Historiarum*, Langtoft, Hemingburgh, etc. See memo. *De morte Regis* in Rymer under date 7th July, 1307.

[3] Bower, *Scotichronicon*, ii. 236.

[4] Camden's *Britannia*, 842.

No. VIII.

TORPHICHEN AND THE KNIGHTS OF ST. JOHN OF JERUSALEM IN SCOTLAND.

BY

JOHN EDWARDS, F.S.A. Scot.

[*Read at a Meeting of the Society held on 18th February, 1897.*]

Torphichen is a village lying in an upland district about five miles south-west of Linlithgow and three miles north of Bathgate. Its population is under five hundred. According to the census of 1891 that of the parish was 967. In the village stands the Parish Church surrounded by the old graveyard, and immediately to the east and abutting on the gable of the church is the partially ruinous but roofed building known locally as "The Quier," being the transept of a church of which the nave and chancel are not now standing. This building is all that now remains of the head-quarters in Scotland of one of the most renowned orders of the Middle Ages—the Knights Hospitallers or Knights of Saint John of Jerusalem.

On examining the existing buildings one finds that they consist of the north and south transepts of what has been a fine church with features of the transitional period and later additions of fifteenth and early sixteenth century workmanship. But there are remarkable peculiarities about the buildings. Above the church is a central tower which has had two floors, and over the north and south transepts are buildings of less height than the tower containing dwelling rooms. As the authors of *The Castellated and Domestic Architecture of Scotland* remark, "The first sight of the great massive tower would lead one to suppose it to be the remains of some

old baronial keep, and it is only when the traceried windows and the surrounding churchyard come into view that one perceives the true character of the building."[1] On first visiting Torphichen one is struck by the manifest neglect with which this unique Scottish edifice has been treated. The transepts have been used as an addition to the churchyard, and also as a store for wood, etc., and it seems a pity that more should not be done to preserve with reverent care what is left to us of this deeply interesting building. It is apparent on examination that there have been other erections on the north, and it is probable that the hospitium where the Brethren entertained strangers, from monarchs downwards, was here. A building about ninety feet to the north, lately used as a cattle shed, has old walls, and there are traces of extensive structures on the ground between this and the transept. On the south-east there has been an arcade now entirely gone, and we can readily gather that when the Order was at its height in wealth and power in Scotland, the Hospital and Church of St. John were in every way befitting the position of power and distinction held by the Knights in the country.

It is not my intention to occupy your time with any general historical account of the Order of the Knights Hospitallers of Saint John of Jerusalem. I would just recall the fact that in its origin—owing its birth to pious merchants of Amalfi—it was not a military order, and that its original patron saint was neither St. John the Baptist nor St. John the Evangelist, but St. John the Almoner, a Cypriote who had been Patriarch of Alexandria.[2] Early in the twelfth century it became military, and adopted the Baptist as its patron. Thereafter it preserved, like its sister Order the Templars, its semi-clerical, semi-laic character till its decline. One or two details connected with its internal organization are worth recalling. And first, I would remind you that, while the Order was in the twelfth century divided into seven "languages"—Provence, Auvergne, France, Italy, Arragon, England, and Germany, to which Castille and Portugal were afterwards added as a

[1] *Castellated and Domestic Architecture*, vol. v., p. 131. I am indebted to Mr. Thomas Ross, F.S.A. Scot., joint author of this valuable work, for much information regarding the architectural features of the buildings.

[2] Hallam, *Europe in Middle Ages* (Murray's edition), p. 32, note.

single language, Scotland was never a separate language. It was embraced in England. This is borne out by the conduct of the early Preceptors in Scotland, who are Norman strangers, and are to be found taking a side against the liberties of Scotland, also by the Report to Headquarters by Philip de Thame, to which I will refer subsequently, and by various other facts which will appear as we proceed.

The Hospitallers, like the Templars, were a cosmopolitan body, of no country themselves, but owing implicit obedience to the Grand Master and Supreme Council at Acre, or in Rhodes or Malta. They readily came to adapt themselves to the habits and laws of the country where they established themselves, and as the members of the Order had the easy superiority which travel brings, when living among neighbours the bulk of whom have been rooted to the spot all their lives, their influence rapidly grew. "We might be nearly sure," says Mr. Kemble,[1] "even if we had not the positive evidence of history, that the arrangements of the Order were adapted in every land to the exigencies and accidents of their position. In Syria they encamped, in Rhodes they fortified, in France and England they farmed and amassed money for the general purposes of the ruling body." Every Preceptor was a steward, bound to account periodically to headquarters for the funds passing through his hands and to remit the balance after deducting expenses of administration. We are in possession of the Report of the Prior of the Order in England, Philip de Thame, to the Grand Master, Elyan de Villanova, for the year 1338, which was discovered in Malta in 1838 by the Rev. Lambert B. Larking, transcribed by him *in extenso*, and published by the Camden Society in 1857, with an instructive Introduction by Mr. Mitchell Kemble. In this return we find (p. 129) under the heading *Scocia*—"The lands and tenements, rents and services, the churches appropriated, and all the possessions of the hospital in Scotland, have been destroyed, consumed by reason of the fierce war (*fortis guerra*) which has lasted there for many years, through which nothing can in these days be collected. It was wont, however, in time of peace to return per annum 200 marks. Brother William de la Fforde,

[1] *The Knights Hospitallers in England* (Camden Society), Intro. p. xiv.

Chaplain, maintains his post (*perhendinat*) in Scotland, at whose expense is unknown." After the Extent or Return of their own proper possessions there follows the Extent of the possessions formerly belonging to the Temple (*extenta bonorum quondam Templi*), and here again we have the name *Scocia* with this melancholy statement added: "Respecting the lands, tenements, rents, services, churches, and all other possessions which belonged to the Templars in Scotland, they produce nothing, nor can anything be extended because they have been altogether destroyed, burnt up (*ambusta*), and reduced to nothing (*adnullata*), through the fierce war continued through many years; nevertheless they were wont in the time of the Templars and in the time of peace to show a return of 300 marks." From this it will be seen that at this date (1338) the Prior of the Order in England was responsible for the return from Scotland, and it would have been most interesting if he had been able to give us a detailed profit and loss account for the Hospital and Temple lands in Scotland as he was able to do for the greater part of England. How gladly we would have learned more about Brother William de la Fforde and his experiences among the tumultuous Scots, and whether he got his rations satisfactorily while holding on at Torphichen.

The Brethren took the usual monastic vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. They were divided into three classes—(1) The Knights (*milites*); (2) the Chaplains (*capellani*); (3) the Serjeants-at-Arms or Esquires (*servientes armorum*). While the Knights were first in rank, the Esquires being all gentlemen by descent, were eligible to be raised to the higher order, and there is occasionally the apparent anomaly in England of a manor being administered by an Esquire as Preceptor, while the Knight is a simple Frater. Doubtless this was the exception, caused by some circumstance unknown to us now, such as the Knight being an old man. Regarding the Chaplains, they had charge of the religious portion of the duties of the Order, and I am inclined to think, from the fact that in the year for which we have the Return, they were not so numerous in England as the Esquires, and also from there being Chaplains in the pay of the Order in many of the manors, that it was not the most popular of the three classes. In the Middle Ages the young noble preferred to win his

way to Paradise with his good sword against the Infidel, however willing he might be in old age to pray and do penance for his sins and shortcomings, and the Church encouraged him in taking this view. We can form but a faint conception of the religious enthusiasm which the early crusades aroused in Europe. "There was no nation so remote," says William of Malmesbury,[1] "no people so retired, as did not respond to the Papal wishes. The Welshman left his hunting—the Scot his fellowship with vermin—the Dane his drinking party—the Norwegian his raw fish." I do not stay to repel the base insinuation of the chronicler against the Scots—what better can we expect from a Caudatus Anglicus? This enthusiasm was the secret of the rapid growth in wealth and influence of the three Orders—Hospitallers, Templars, and Teutonic Knights. As Mr. Froude puts it, "Religion in the eleventh century became the ruling principle of life to an extent which has never perhaps been equalled, save in Protestant countries in the century which succeeded the Reformation."[2] The result of all this was that the military orders became rapidly rich, great, and privileged. So rich and so influential, that in the case of the Templars the envy their proud position gave rise to was the chief cause of their downfall.

The Hospital at Torphichen is said to have been founded by David I. during the first half of the twelfth century. There does not seem to be any proof of this. The *Book of Cupar*, it is true, states: 'Saint David attached to himself the most noble brethren of the distinguished Knighthood of the Temple of Jerusalem, and made them by day and night the guardians of his morals.'[3] This statement, however, apparently applies to the Templars, and there seems to be little doubt regarding their introduction into Scotland having taken place in the reign of King David I. Dr. Stuart, in his report to the Historical MSS. Commission on the Arniston Muniments, says, "The lands of which the estate is composed originally belonged to

---

[1] Book IV., c. 2 (Giles's edition), p. 364.

[2] Froude's *Spanish Armada and other Essays*, p. 256.

[3] Maidment's *Templaria*, p. 1. *Sanctus David de praeclara militia Templi Hierosolemitani optimos fratres secum retinens eos diebus et noctibus morum suorum fecit custodes.*

the Knights Templars, who received from King David I. a grant of the lands of Balantrodach on the South Esk, where they established their principal seat."[1] It is very probable that the Hospitallers settled in the country about the same time or shortly after. We have seen that the earliest portion of their Church is twelfth century work, and being the older of the two Orders by a few years, it is not likely that they were behind the Templars in establishing themselves here. A Charter by King James IV., dated at Edinburgh, 19th October, 1488, and first year of his reign,[2] recites the various charters previously granted by his predecessors "to the Holy Hospital of Jerusalem, and to the Brethren of the Knighthood of the Temple of Solomon."[3] Earliest in date of these is a Charter granted by Malcolm IV. at Brechin in the Episcopate of Bishop Sonsan (*circa* 1153). By it King Malcolm confirms "*Deo et Sancto Hospitali de Jerusalem unum plenarium toftum in quolibet burgo totius terrae suae.*" James IV.'s Charter also recites and confirms, among others, two Charters granted by Alexander II. The first of these, dated at Edinburgh Castle, 30th June, 1231, confirms to the said Brethren all gifts of lands, men, tenants, and alms formerly made to them, as well in churches, as in other privileges and worldly possessions, with sok and sac, quit of toll and secular service.[4] The second is dated at Stirling in the year 1236. By it the King grants to the Brethren foresaid, for the love of God and the souls of David, King of Scots, and of King William, father of the said Alexander, all gifts, etc., granted by him and his predecessors in times past, with soc, sac, and thole and theme, infangtheif and outfangtheif girthbrekin and bludewite, flemgirthe and murthure, 'latrociniis' and forcement in time past and to come. In a subsequent Charter, granted by Alexander III., a special privilege was conferred on the Order, which more than seventy years afterwards the then Preceptor was not slow to claim. The Charter

---

[1] *Hist. MSS. Commission*, 3rd Report, p. 414.

[2] *Reg. Mag. Sig.*, 1 Jac. iv., No. 1791.

[3] *Sancto Hospitali de Jerusalem et Fratribus ejusdem Militie Templi Salamonis.*

[4] "*Et de omnibus aliis consuetudinibus secularibus excepta solum hominis justicia condempnati, exceptis quatuor querelis corone.*" The exceptions are interesting.

is dated in 1284, and, among other things, cedes to St. John and the Brethren all fines and amerciaments imposed within their jurisdiction by the King or his Bailies, declaring that if the Friars should themselves be taxed or fined by civil authority they shall be quit for one ell of scarlet alb (*pro una ulna albi scarleti*).[1] In 1359 this privilege troubles the Sheriff of Linlithgow, for we find in his *Compotus* that he credits himself with 40s. for one fine of each man of the Master of the Hospital of Torphyfyn, who, on the plea of his privilege, said that for whatever fine in whatsoever court of a civil judge against any one of his men, the Master of the said Order or his *locum tenens* should offer only one ell of alb cloth (*albi panni*), and should keep the said ell himself. That is, he should make an elusory or *pro forma* offer of the cloth. The Sheriff accordingly refers the matter to the King's decision. We may be sure the Master did not give up his privilege.

The Register of the Monastery of Paisley contains a Charter by Alexander, the son of Walter the Steward of Scotland, dated in 1252, in favour of the monks. The first witness is Brother Theobald, Master of Torpheyn.[2] As the son of the Steward tells us that he was about to set out on pilgrimage, it was very appropriate that he should call in the Master of Torphichen to give him the benefit of his experience in travel. No doubt, in addition to witnessing the Charter, the Knight of St. John was able to give him many valuable hints as to his projected journey.

In 1264 the Reckoning of R. de Mowbray, Sheriff of Linlithgow, for the previous year, contains the following item: "To the Master of Torphechin through two amerciaments (*misericordias*) remitted to him and to John Blonde through the King's letter . . . lxxiis."[3]

These references are interesting as showing the early style of the head of the Order in Scotland to have been simply Master of Torphichen. We shall see that several additions to and variations of the title were introduced later on.

In 1291 "Friar Alexander, Prior of the Hospital of Saint John of

---

[1] *Reg. Mag. Sig.*, 1 Jac. iv., No. 1791.

[2] *Registrum Monas. de Passelet*, p. 90.

[3] *Exchequer Rolls of Scotland*, vol. i., p. 26.

Jerusalem, and Friar Brian, Preceptor of the soldiery of the Temple in Scotland, swore fealty to Edward I. in the King's Chamber in the Castle of Edinburgh."[1] The same Prior, now called "Friar Alisaundre de Welles, Warden of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in Scotland," again did homage in 1296.[2] He was slain at the battle of Falkirk in 1298 along with Friar Brian de Jaye, who had also done homage as we have seen to Edward.[3] About this time we have a notice of the Hospital from which one may infer that there was building going on, and also that the Preceptor and his brethren were in favour with the King of England. It is a grant by Edward I. of three oaks from the forest of Kiltyre, and runs as follows: "The Sheriff of Stirling is ordered to cause to be supplied to the Master of the Hospital of Saint John of Jerusalem at Thorfighyn three oaks suited for building of the King's gift."[4] As the warrant for this gift is dated at Berwick-on-Tweed, on 3rd September, 1296, two years before the Battle of Falkirk, it is quite possible that the Knights were fortifying their Preceptory. About this time they sent the following petition to the King: "To our Lord the King and to his Council, pray the Prior and Brethren of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in England and Scotland for their English Brethren in Scotland, that whereas it is a great security to the English residents in Scotland to have access to a Castle or fortress near them, in case of many accidents which might arise, *although the land is now settled*, he would be pleased to grant them of his grace the privilege of access into his Castle of Linlithgow, which is only two leagues from Torphichen, for the safety of themselves and their goods, when there shall be need, and as an aid and defence for the said Castle if necessary. And that he would send a letter to this effect if he please to his Constable of Linlithgow."[5] The King was not quite sure whether he could depend on the Hospitallers, and he grants the petition with a

---

[1] Bain's *Calendar*, ii., 125. [2] *Ibid.*, ii., 202.

[3] Hailes' *Ann.*, i., p. 318. 3rd edition.

[4] Stevenson's *Hist. Documents* (Scotland), vol. ii., p. 98.

[5] *Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 98. The original is in Norman-French.

condition, "provided nevertheless that the Constable be sure of them, and that their stay there be for the safety of the Castle." Scotland was at all times a most troublesome country to conquer, and when you thought you had conquered it, you found that your troubles were only beginning.

In the month of March, 1298, an important event in the history of the Preceptory falls to be recorded. Sir William Wallace took up his residence there, and thence issued the only Charter that has come down to us granted by him. In it he styles himself "guardian of the Realm of Scotland and general of the armies of the same" (*custos regni Scocie et ductor exercituum ejusdem*). The subject of the grant is the office of Constable of the Castle of Dundee and certain lands adjoining, and the person to whom the grant is made is "Alexander called Skirmischur"—now Scrimgeour—and his services to the State thereby rewarded are having borne the Royal Standard of Scotland in the recent battles. The grant is made in name of King John (Balliol), and is sealed with the Royal Seal "at Torpheichyn, the 29th day of March, 1298."[1] Within a few short months the patriot Wallace was to be a fugitive—a lover of his country for whom there was no quarter—hunted down wherever he might take refuge. Such was then the guerdon of the gallant deliverer of his country.

It is almost certain that Wallace took possession of the Preceptory by force—the Knights having probably withdrawn to the Castle of Linlithgow.

The battle of Falkirk took place on 22nd July, 1298. We know that the victor, King Edward, was at Stirling on the 26th, for we have a Letter of Presentation to the Church of Stobo issued by him from it on that date, and by the 9th of August he was at Torphichen, as the following Letter of Presentation proves: "*Robertus de Cartereto habet litteras regis de praesentatione ad ecclesiam de Monymel vacantem et ad donationem regis spectantem ratione episcopatus Sancti Andreae in Scotia vacantis et in manu regis existentis. Et diriguntur litterae custodi spiritualitatis episcopatus praedicti.*

"*Teste rege apud Torphigkyn, nono die Augusti. Per breve de Privato Sigillo.*"[2]

---

[1] Anderson, *Diplomata*, fol. xliii.

[2] *Patent Rolls*, 26, Edward I., m. 25. Stevenson's *Hist. Documents*, vol. ii., p. 289.

As is well known, the King is reported to have been kicked by a restive horse, breaking two of his ribs, on the night before the battle. It shows the warlike valour of his character that, notwithstanding, he conducted the operations of his army personally, and after the battle moved on with them to Stirling. It is quite possible, however, that the need of rest brought him to Torphichen, where he would be hospitably received and carefully tended by the Brethren, who had doubtless sent some of their number in the train of their master, Alexander de Welles, into the battle to fight for the English. It is not pleasant to think of the difficulties a patriot like Wallace had to encounter in the higher ranks from the Norman influences, which caused men, to whom in other circumstances the country was entitled to look as leaders against its foes, either to stand coldly aside or to be found in the ranks of the enemy.

The next Master, Ralph de Lindesay, comes into view in the year 1304 in connection with remarkable complaints to King Edward against Sir Mathew de Redman, Sheriff of Dumfries. As giving a glimpse of the conditions of life in the south of Scotland during the English supremacy the record is worth quoting: "Complaints against Sir Maheu de Redman, Sheriff of Dumfries. He imprisoned William Jargon, and notwithstanding a fine of 40s. given for his good will, impressed all the carts in the country, and carried off William's corn to the value of 10 marks and more. And though the King of his grace gave William and other good men of Dumfries seisin of their lands, Sir Mathew by 'duresse' extorted fines from them, some 1 mark, and others more or less, for getting possession. And he and his sergeants seek occasion to grieve and distress the poor people by tallages. When William, who was in the King's service guarding the peace of the town, saw Sir Mathew's outrages, and was going to complain to the Guardian and Treasurer, Sir Mathew seized his horse and keeps it to his damage of 100s. and more. He also took all the beasts that came one market day, to the number of 100 oxen and cows, and afterwards took fines before delivering them, except 5 cows which he sent to Stirling—2 of these being taken from a poor stranger, Thomas of Hardinstone by name, who had bought them for 16s., and keeps them still, though his sergeant had 6d. to deliver them up.

"John de Heytone prays remedy from the King and Council against the said Sir Maheu, who has disseised him of the lands he held of the Hospital

of St. John both before and since the war, and has done the same lawlessly and by means of champerty with Makun of Terregles, made at the King's last Parliament of St. Andrews, as contained in the following transcript of said champerty. [Transcript.] 'Letters Patent by Maheu de Redeman, declaring that as Malcolm of Terregles is due him 100 marks sterling by a recognizance in the King's chancery at St. Andrews, payable by equal portions at Easter and Michaelmas next, he binds himself and his heirs, if Malcolm gives and enfeoffs him in the half of all lands, rents and debts which he acquires by plea or otherwise in the County of Dumfries (provided he always goes by the granter's advice), to free him of the recognizance. Appends his seal. Done at St. Andrews, 28th March, in the King's 32nd year.'

"He also took an ox from John's plough, worth 20s., against law. Likewise ejected him from 12 tofts in Dumfries, called 'Our Lady's tofts,' which John held in mortgage, and detains them to his damage of 100s. and more. Also from the tofts and burgages formerly of Gilbert le fiz Bel, of which John was possessed before and since the war, and has given seisin of them by means of champerty to John le Espicer, who was never in seisin before the war, nor his father nor mother, brother or sister, nor 'uncle or aunte,' and has done this in the petitioner's absence, to his damage of 10*l.* and more, as if the lands had been in the King's hand, whereas John was always of the King's party." (The original is in Norman-French.) [Endorsed.] "The Guardian of these parts, the Chamberlain of Scotland, James de Dallileghe, and Friar Ralph de Lindesee, Warden of the Hospital of St. John, or 3 or 2 of them, are appointed to hear and determine the case. The Chamberlain of Scotland to issue the appointment under the Great Seal of Scotland."[1]

We are not informed what decision was pronounced by these judges, and unfortunately we have no record of Sir Mathew's defence, and therefore cannot say much regarding the rights and wrongs of this dispute, but it shows that King Edward had confidence in the Warden of the Hospital of St. John, and we may infer that he was at this time, outwardly, at all events, "of the King's party."

---

[1] Bain's *Calendar*, ii., p. 296.

Passing on to the year 1310, we find that Henry de Peremort is Master of Torphichen, for under date 5th January there is in the English Controller's Book of Bills an entry as follows: "Friar Henry de Peremort, Hospitaller, Master of Torphichen, of victuals to the value of 44s. for those bought from him for the pele of Linlithgow." Next year (1311), among the Muster Rolls of the English garrisons in Scotland, there appears an entry of this nature: "To the Master of the Hospital of Torphiffyn,[1] the price of 12 salmon, *viz.* 12s., from the dues of the Burgh of Stirling."[2] One can see from these entries that the Master and his confreres were on the side of England in the struggle now going on, and we must not judge them harshly on this account. For it must be remembered that the Pope, as head of the Church, was against Bruce since the murder of Comyn, and that the Hospitallers in Scotland, who, moreover, depended on England as being a branch of the English "tongue," were bound to lend no countenance to the man who had been guilty of sacrilege.

We next get a notice of the Order in Scotland in 1322, when, on 16th September in that year, "Randekyn de la More, a Scottishman, has letters of safe conduct to come to Bamburgh, to speak with Friar John de Bynbroke, of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, on business of the Order for a month."[3] One wonders if this is the same gentleman as the "Renaud More, Scotsman," who two years before went on pilgrimage abroad along with James de Conyngham, and to whom Richard Trot was assigned as escort, and "to see that they kept to the high road" when passing through England.[4] Little wonder if the Scottish Knights of St. John by and by became good patriots and defenders of their country, if they were treated as suspicious characters, to be watched closely in travelling, as gentlemen were wont then to do to foreign parts, on the way to the Holy Land.

About this period the affairs of the Order had got into confusion, owing to the internal dissensions which were taking place in Rhodes between Fulk

---

[1] We need not be surprised at the English scribe writing "Torphiffyn." In the same document Cambuskenneth is written "Skamskinel."

[2] Bain's *Calendar*, vol. iii., No. 121, and p. 405.

[3] *Ibid.*, iii., 776.

[4] *Ibid.*, Nos. 692-3.

de Villaret, Grand Master, and a section of the Knights headed by Maurice de Pagnac. The disorder had spread through all the Commanderies, and in England things were drifting into insolvency under Thomas l'Archer, Prior of the English Tongue. On the accession of Elyan de Villeneuf to the supreme command of the Order, the position of affairs began steadily to improve. He despatched Leonard de Tybertis, Prior of Venice, to England, with full power to act as his lieutenant in making a thorough inquiry into the revenues and general state of the Order in England, which included, we must remember, Scotland and Ireland. Thomas l'Archer, *senio et debilitate confractus*,[1] prayed to be relieved of an office for which he does not appear to have been at his best very fit. It is hardly necessary to remind you that it was with great difficulty that the Hospitallers obtained possession of the estates and properties of the Templars, and although from the suppression of the latter Order in 1312 their whole property in England, including Scotland and Ireland, passed to the Order of St. John, yet it was years after before they obtained possession, and they had to expend large sums of money in bribing the English judges, from the Chief Baron of Exchequer, Chief Justice of the "Common Bench," and Chief Justice of the King's Bench down to the clerks in Chancery. We are in possession of the names of all these gentlemen, along with sums paid them annually, set down in a matter-of-fact way on the credit side of the account rendered in 1338, to which I have already alluded.[2] I mention this to show the difficulties that beset the Order at the time of, and for years after, the suppression of the Templars. The consideration of it may call forth feelings of satisfaction that the vindication of one's rights in a Court of Law is not quite so expensive and so uncertain in the nineteenth century as it was in the fourteenth. Mr. Kemble says: "It is not without a feeling of indignation that we find this powerful community compelled to bestow large sums and even estates upon the judicial authorities and administrative officers of the Crown in the counties where their tenements lay. If their demands were just, and they were yet obliged to buy their right at such a price, what must have

[1] Rymer, *Foedera*, iv., p. 378.

[2] *The Knights Hospitallers in England* (Camden Socy.), p. 203.

been the condition of poorer and weaker men! If their demands were unjust, what must the condition of the Courts and the administration of the laws have been!"[1]

On Thomas l'Archer's retiral, Leonard de Tybertis, as interim Prior, took vigorous measures to put the finances into a better state. In this he was so successful that in 1328 the Order, at a Chapter held at Melchbourn, a manor of the Knights in Bedfordshire, petitioned the Grand Master, Elyan de Villanova, to appoint him to the permanent office of Prior of England. In this petition the Knights give Friar Leonard, as *locum tenens*, a very high character, declaring that had it not been for his speedy arrival, what with usurious interest to the Lombards and Perugians and writs of *fieri facias* (*brevia que "fieri facias" vulgariter appellantur*), the Order would have been entirely ruined. He, however, freed them and the Priory from the abyss which yawned before them (*de laqueo perditionis liberavit*) through the favour which he found in the eyes of their Lord the King and their Lady the Queen and the other Magnates of the Royal Court.[2] He was accordingly appointed to the high office of Prior of the English "tongue" or nation. True to his energetic character, we find that in 1331 he was about to visit Scotland, for in that year King Edward III. "signifies that he has taken under his special protection and safe conduct till Michaelmas next Friar Leonardus de Tybertis, Prior of the Hospital of Saint John of Jerusalem in England, and Lieutenant of the Grand Master of the Hospital in Scotland and Ireland, who is about to visit the priories and places of the Hospital in Scotland for correction and reformation, and commands all to aid him."[3]

In passing on we may say that the Order reached high-water mark in England at this time. In 1328 it was financially at very low ebb, while "in 1338 it could account for a surplus of income over expenditure in England alone of nearly £6,840."[4] It seems a pity that the Order in England did not use its resources against the infidels alone. It is impossible

---

[1] *The Knights Hospitallers in England* (Camden Socy.), Intro., p. xli.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 219.

[3] Bain's *Calendar*, iii., 1044.

[4] *The Knights Hospitallers in England*, p. lxix.

for us to sympathize with procedure such as is indicated in the following entry in the Patent Rolls: "The King declares that as Friar Philip de Thame, Prior of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in England, sent at his request and maintained 10 men-at-arms at his own cost in the army in Scotland for half a year, this voluntary aid shall form no precedent."[1] This was in 1338, and from the return of the Manors in England, to which we have before referred, we find that there were in that year 34 Knights, 48 Esquires, 34 Chaplains in England, and three brethren whose status we are ignorant of, making 119 in all. The Prior of Clerkenwell could readily spare ten, but he might have found a nobler cause in which to unsheath the sword.

As, unfortunately, we have no Scottish Balance Sheet such as we have for England, but as the internal economy of a Preceptory, wherever situated, was pretty much the same, I think it may be of interest to go to the Return for 1338, and extract from it the detailed statement of the Preceptory of Chibourn in Northumberland, which, if not in Scotland, is near the border, and for this reason I have selected it.

Income.

(1) There is there a mansion-house or dwelling in a dilapidated state, the kitchen-garden (*herbagium*) of which is worth per annum, -	6/
(2) There are 190 acres of land, the value of each acre 4d., thus worth	63/4
(3) Also 8 acres of meadow, the value of the acre 2/, thus worth -	16/
(4) Also 20 marks of assessed rent (*i.e.* rent paid by freeholders) in time of peace which now, on account of the war in Scotland, can hardly be paid; value per annum, - - - - - -	110/
(5) Also voluntary contributions (*ffraria*) per annum, on account of the foresaid war, 12½ marks and no more, because this domain (*bajulia*) is on the Scottish Border (and no sum is extended out).	
(6) And of fees and perquisites of the Courts (of the Manor), per annum, - - - - - - - - - - - - -	10/
(7) Also pasture, as well for cows as for sheep, - - - - -	40/
(8) And of farms (*i.e.* rents) and mills, per annum, - - -	5 marks
The sum total of the receipts and profits of the said Bailiewick (or Preceptory), - - - - - -	35 marks 12/

[1] Bain's *Calendar*, iii., 1255.

Expenditure (Reprise).

(1) Expenses of the House: *viz.* for the Preceptor, 2 brethren, and others of the household as is necessary, and also for other guests (*supervenientibus*) for the above-mentioned cause. In loaf bread per annum, 25 quarters—the price of the quarter 3/; thus the cost is - - - - - - - - - -	75/
(2) In beer brewed, 28 quarters of barley malt—the price of the quarter 2/; thus the cost is - - - - - - - -	56/
(3) Also the cost of the Kitchen, as in flesh, fish, etc.—1/6 per week,	78/
(4) Also for robes, mantles, and other necessaries for the Preceptor and his confrater,[1] - - - - - - - - - -	69/4
(5) Also for the stipend of one Chaplain per annum, - - -	15/
(6) Also for the stipend of one Chamberlain per annum, - -	10/
(7) Also for the Stableman, 5/; and for one Page, 3/, - - -	8/
(8) Also in the wage of one Washerwoman (*lotrix*) per annum, -	/12
(9) Also William of Wirklee receives, per annum, to the end of his life, by the Charter of the Chapter, - - - - - -	20/
(10) Also to a certain Seneschal defending the affairs of the House (legal affairs), per annum, - - - - - - - -	6/8
(11) Also to the Clerk (*clericus*), who collects the voluntary contributions (*confraria*), per annum, - - - - - - -	1 mark
Total of all the Expenses and Payments, - -	26 marks 6s. 8d.

Total Value.—There thus remain to pay to the Treasury, in order to defray the burdens (of the Order), ix. marks vi.s. viii.d. and no more, because the land is destroyed and greatly devastated through the Scottish War.

Names of the Brethren—

Brother JOHN DE BILTON, Esquire [*serviens*], Preceptor.
" JOHN DACOMBE, Chaplain.
" SIMON DENGAYNE, Esquire [*serviens*].[2]

---

[1] With regard to this item, we may mention that a fixed sum each year was allowed for dress in every Preceptory. It was as follows:

	£1	0	0	for a robe.
	0	6	8	for a mantle.
	0	8	0	for other necessaries.
Total,	£1	14	8	

There being in Chiburn the Preceptor and one Confrater, it follows that the sum allowed for dress is twice 34/8 = 69/4.

[2] *The Knights Hospitallers in England*, p. 52. The original is in Latin.

We may take it that the above is somewhat like the balance sheet, if one were extant, of Torphichen, with this material difference, that at this time there was no balance to remit to headquarters.

It has generally been considered doubtful whether the Hospitallers in Scotland were even at this date in actual possession of the lands and properties of the Templars. Referring to the Charter by King James IV., already mentioned, Mr. Maidment remarks: "This ratification is expressly limited to the estates, possessions, and privileges from time to time gifted to the Hospitallers, and no allusion is made to the estates of the Templars. Unquestionably Charters must have existed, but these in like manner with the ancient Chartularies and other papers connected with the Hospitallers and Templars have been lost and cannot be traced."[1] This last sentence requires to be somewhat modified. The manuscripts of Mr. Dundas of Arniston (the ancient Balantrodoc) have, since Maidment wrote, been catalogued; and among other deeds there has been discovered "a Charter by Brother Thomas of Lyndesay, Master of the Hospital of Saint John of Jerusalem at Balantrodoc, dated on the Saturday before the Feast of St. Barnabas, 1354, confirming a Charter by William, son of Christina, to her cousin, Alexander Symple, of the land belonging to her in the town of Espertone."[2] Thus in David II.'s time we have proof of the Knights of St. John being in possession of the principal seat of the Templars—Balantrodoc—and we may infer that they were in possession of at least a considerable number of their other estates throughout the country.

In 1342—twelve years before the date of the Charter above quoted—Sir Robert de Fordone was Preceptor, for in that year the King of England (Edward III.) "signifies to his lieges, both of Scotland and England, that he has granted a safe conduct till the Assumption of the B.V. Mary to Friar Robert de Fordone, Preceptor of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem in Scotland, coming to attend the Chapter-General of the Order in England."[3] On June 1st, 1345, the King issues "Letters patent to the Wardens of the Scottish March and all others," from which we learn that

[1] *Templaria*, p. 2. [2] *Hist. MSS. Commission*, 3rd Report, Appendix, p. 414.
[3] Bain's *Calendar*, vol. iii., 1393.

Friar Alexander de Seton had succeeded Sir Robert de Fordone, and was then "on the point of coming to London at the command of his Prior and Superior in England."[1] Sir Alexander de Seton took steps to recover possessions of the Order which had been seized and retained by Sir William More, Knight, son and heir of Reginald More.[2] An action was raised against him, and he was charged to pay the sum of £421 16s. 6d., the amount due the Hospital, within one month under pain of excommunication. It seems probable that the Mores were supporters of King Robert the Bruce,[3] and that the lukewarmness—not to use a stronger term—of the Preceptors during the War of Independence induced the King and national party to oust the then head of the Order—possibly Henry de Peremort—and put in Sir Reginald More. This view has some grounds to go upon from the above action, and also from a Charter granted by Sir William More, wherein he calls himself Keeper (*custos*) of the Hospital of St. John of Torpheyn.[4]

By 20th October, 1351, Sir Alexander de Seton must have been dead, as on that date "Letters of Safe Conduct and protection addressed to the King's Officers and friends, both in England and in Scotland," are issued, "for two years on behalf of Friar Thomas de Lyndesey, *confrater* of Friar Philip de Thame, prior of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in England, who by his Superior's orders is about to set out to Scotland to take charge of the possessions and goods of the Hospital *and the Temple* there, and forward other affairs." This is the same Preceptor who grants the Charter of Temple lands referred to above in 1354, and it will be observed that his instructions on leaving England are "to take charge of the possessions and goods of the Hospital and the Temple there." I have no doubt that Sir Thomas de Lyndesey asserted the rights of the Hospitallers in virtue of the Papal Bull of 1312, and took actual possession of Balantrodoc and such other properties of the Templars as he could

[1] Bain's *Calendar*, vol. iii., 1446.

[2] Probably the Renaud More mentioned above as going in 1320 on pilgrimage abroad.

[3] Robertson's *Index Ch.*, p. 11, No. 36.

[4] Spottiswoode, *Miscellany*, vol. ii., 4, 5.

peaceably obtain, and lost no time in prosecuting his claims in the Scottish Courts to such as were not ceded. I think we can identify him with a *Frater Thomas de Lynlee* who appears in the Extent for 1338 as one of the two Brethren in charge of the Manor of Grafton in Warwickshire. In support of this, it may be pointed out that the Extent itself is a copy in the sense that it is a transference into a book or ledger by a clerk in Rhodes of the returns sent in. It also contains several errors due to the manifest ignorance of the scribe, some of which are pointed out by the editor, and one can quite understand how a foreigner, unacquainted with English and Scottish names, might readily write an "l" for an "s" in copying the name into the ledger which has come down to us. If this view be correct, then he belonged to the class of the Chaplains—and I would like to indulge the fancy that he may have built the "Columbarium," traces of which still exist at Torphichen, for from the Extent we find that there was one at Grafton which yielded 6s. 8d. of a profit annually.[1]

In 1377 a Scottish medical man comes into view in connection with the Order. We may look upon him as a pioneer in that career of popularity which the profession has since enjoyed in England. Walter Carlel, 'leche,' has Letters of Protection from 24th November till Easter next going with Friar Robert de Hales, Prior of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem, admiral of the West Seas.[2] The English prior and admiral doubtless found the advantage of having a doctor on board.

The continual comings and goings between the Knights in Scotland and those in England were of great service in softening the asperities of a fierce and warlike age. A sidelight is thrown on the difficulties under which a Scottish merchant carried on foreign trade in the fourteenth century by the following extract, and it also brings before us the fact that the head of the Order in England was ready to see justice done: "Warrant on Exchequer to surcease the demand on Thomas, son of Godfrey de Roos, and Peter Torold of London, skynner, for 100*l.* penalty, under which they were bound to produce Finalay Ussher, a Scottish merchant, to answer to any Englishman laying claim to a cargo of 16 lasts, 2 barrels

[1] *The Knights Hospitallers in England*, p. 41.

[2] Bain's *Calendar*, iv., 249.

herring, and 2 chests of cloth shipped by him in the parts of Scone in a Seland Vessel for Flanders, which was driven out of her course to the mouth of the Humber, and there arrested by Thomas Percy, admiral of the northern fleet, in violation of the late truce with Robert, King of Scotland, and to said merchant's damage and loss; and it having been attested by word of mouth of John, King of Castile and Leon, duke of Lancaster, and the Prior of St. John of Jerusalem in England, the Treasurer, and by Letters of Henry Percy, earl of Northumberland, one of the Wardens of the March, that Finalay personally attended before them on different march days to answer to any claimants, but none appeared, and he now demands the herrings, etc., as his property, and has further taken his 'corporal oath' in Chancery that he will be present next march day to answer; the King has released his manucaptors as he demands."[1] Finalay Ussher was evidently the type of merchant pictured by Solomon as 'diligent in his business,' and he therefore stood before kings.

Sir John of Benyng, Chaplain, was Preceptor in 1388, for in that year he obtains a safe conduct to come and go at pleasure between England and Scotland, with four mounted attendants, on the affairs of the Order. He is called Governor of the lands and possessions of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in Scotland.[2]

In 1404 the affairs of the Order in Scotland were again causing trouble to the Prior of Clerkenwell, for on 16th March the English Chancellor issues letters to Friar Hildebrand Wotton of the Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in England, permitting him to go to Scotland, and there demand from Sir Adam Forster, Knight of Scotland, certain sums of money due by him to the Prior and Brethren of the Order for their lands and possessions in Scotland, occupied and torteously detained by Sir Adam.[3] In all probability he is the same person as Adam Forstere, Esquire, who, along with Sir John of Ramorgny, 'Chivaler Descoce,' has a passport in 1398 to come to the King of England's presence, with a retinue of 40 horsemen on an Embassy from King Robert III.[4] If so, he was a Knight of influence in the realm. In that year the Commissioners

[1] Bain's *Calendar*, iv., 300. [2] *Ibid.*, iv., 378. [3] *Ibid.*, iv., 651. [4] *Ibid.*, iv., 505.

came to an agreement with England, and he was one of the three Scottish Commissioners.[1] In 1399 he is one of the Commissioners who "renew the current truce" with England. We are not told whether Sir Adam paid the sums said to be due by him, but his position was such that it would be an arduous undertaking to compel him, if he refused to go into an accounting with the Prior of England.

In the beginning of the fifteenth century Sir Alexander of Lyghton appears to be at the head of the Order. In 1414 he has a Warrant for safe conducts for himself and John of Bynnyng and Thomas Goodwyn, Brethren of the Hospital in Scotland, with six companions, to attend the Chapter of the Order in England.[2] Sir Alexander de Lichtoun, Knight, Prior of the House of Torfychyne, witnesses a Charter on 28th May, 1422.[3] In 1426 King James I. entrusts letters to the King of England to the keeping of "John Ledalle, Esquire, one of the servants of the Prior of St. John of Jerusalem in Scotland" going to England with two attendants. Next year (1427) Brother Thomas Gudwyn and John Ledal, 'scutifer' and servant of the King, are appointed Procurators of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem, for directing, governing, and levying the lordships, goods, lands, possessions, etc., belonging to said Hospital during the King's pleasure.[4]

In 1432 Sir Andrew Meldrum, Knight, and six attendants, Scotsmen, are found on their way to Rhodes, and in 1434 the King of England (Henry VI.) issues a Warrant to the Chancellor on the supplication of the English Prior, to grant a safe conduct for half a year for "Andrew Melerum (Meldrum) of Scotland, 'obediencer' to said Prior, and six Scotsmen, his servitors, to come to England, to do his duty to the Prior and attend the Chapters, and Assemblies shortly to be held and remain for these objects."[5] This Preceptor seems to have gone frequently to England as he has additional safe conducts to pass through England in the year 1435, and in February and November, 1438, and again in

[1] Bain's *Calendar*, iv., 510.

[2] *Ibid.*, iv., 854.

[3] M'Call's *Parish of Mid-Calder*, p. 253.

[4] *Reg. Magni Sigilli*, 22 Jac. I., No. 104.

[5] Bain's *Calendar*, iv., 1075.

December, 1439.[1] In 1453 Sir Wm. Meldrum has succeeded Sir Andrew.[2] He is said to have been summoned to Rhodes in the same year to account for his maladministration.[3]

The next Preceptor held office in James II.'s reign, and died in 1463.[4] He was Sir Henry Livingston, second son of the first Livingston of Kilsyth, a family of great importance from this time onwards, and holding two earldoms, those of Linlithgow and Callendar.[5] He did not hold the Preceptory long. A lease for three years of Temple lands, "callet ye Briggs lyand within the Lordship of Tempil-liston," granted by him to two nephews exists among the Duntreath Charters.[6] The original record of Temple Courts held by him at the same place, Temple-liston, in January and February, 1459, is also in existence, and bears that the Court was fenced, the suits called, and an assize chosen.[7] The recorded proceedings are interesting as being one of the few existing reports of the forms observed in a Baron's Court of Temple lands.[8]

The next Preceptor, Sir William Knollis, appointed in 1466, was one of the most distinguished holders of the office. He is the first to be called Lord of St. John—a title which his three successors, Sir George Dundas, Sir Walter Lindsay, and Sir James Sandilands, also bore. Hitherto the head of the Order had sat in the Scottish Parliament, on some occasions among the Abbots and Priors, and on others among the feudal Barons. Henceforward the lay character was to predominate over the clerical, and he was to sit among the Peers of the Realm. There was some difficulty about the appointment of Sir William Knollis, which was not finally settled at Rhodes till 1473, when Patrick Scougall, administrator of the Preceptory since the death of Livingston, and a claimant of the office, is non-suited, but gets an indemnity.[9] Knollis, as is well known, was Treasurer under

[1] Bain's *Calendar*, iv., 1087, 1104, 1117, 1137. [2] *Ibid.*, 1255.

[3] M'Call's *Parish of Mid-Calder*, p. 254.

[4] Chalmers' *Caledonia*, vol. iv., p. 874. [5] *Proceedings Socy. Ant. Scot.*, vol. xvii., 313.

[6] Black's *What are Teinds?* p. 31. [7] *Hist. MSS. Commission*, 3rd Report, p. 408.

[8] There is a record among the Duntreath Muniments of another Temple Court held by the same Preceptor in 1461.

[9] M'Call's *Parish of Mid-Calder*, p. 254.

James III. in 1468, and was removed in 1470. After the death of the King at Sauchieburn, he was restored to favour by James IV., and became again Treasurer, an office which he held till 1492. He was also Keeper of Blackness Castle and of Linlithgow Palace.[1] From the high favour he enjoyed with the King, he was able to increase the possessions of the Order greatly.[2] In 1500 his nephew, Patrick Knollis, was appointed his coadjutor, owing to Sir William's age and infirmities rendering him unfit to discharge his duties; and on Patrick's death, Robert Stuart d'Aubigny, a nephew of Lord Bernard d'Aubigny, was appointed to be coadjutor by Bull, dated at Rhodes, 17th March, 1501-2.[3] He is said by Chalmers to have fallen at Flodden. But the records of the Order prove this to be an error, as he was dead before 24th June, 1510.[4]

This Preceptor's career as a politician, warrior, and courtier is well known; but it is equally interesting and less generally known that he was a successful shipowner and trader. On 8th December, 1490, he obtains from the King of England (Henry VII.) protection for a year (if the truce with England lasts so long) for himself or his factors, etc., with his vessel of 80 tons burden, to import merchandise to England, sell the same, and purchase a return cargo for Scotland.[5] By the beginning of the year 1492 his fleet was increasing, as we find that, at the prayer of Master Christopher Ursewik, the King's Almoner, he is granted protection for two years, to trade between the King's dominions and Scotland in lawful goods with his vessels, one or more, of 160 tons burden.[6] He had also a lease of the coal workings of Bonyntoun, with the profits thereof, the rent to be paid to the King being the same quantities of coal as Robert Hammyltoun formerly paid.[7] He acted as one of King James IV.'s ambassadors to France,[8] England,[9] and other countries, on which missions his knowledge of the world and experience of travel by sea and land made it fitting to send him. One is glad to learn, however, from the foregoing

[1] *Reg. Mag. Sigilli*, 22 Jac. IV., 104. [2] Chalmers' *Caledonia*, vol. iv., p. 874.

[3] M'Call's *Parish of Mid-Calder*, p. 254. For an account of the Stewarts, Lords of Aubigny, see Burton's *Scot Abroad*, p. 50 (new edition). [4] *Ibid.*, 255.

[5] Bain's *Calendar*, iv., 1567. [6] *Ibid.*, 1579. [7] *Reg. Mag. Sig.*, 3 Jac. IV., 2003.

[8] Bain's *Calendar*, 1574. [9] *Ibid.*, 1568, 1585, 1586.

notices that he was also one of the pioneers of the Scottish shipping and coal trade. He stands out as a man of force of character and varied attainments at the latter end of the fifteenth century.

Among the Charters at Arniston—the ancient Balantrodach—is one granted by Sir William Knollis, therein called "Preceptor of Torfichin," to George Grynlaw of the lands of Yorkstoun and others, on his own resignation, for payment of 25/ Scots, 21 diets[1] in time of autumn with a reaping hook, 2 diets of a plough in winter and mill and other services; for the lands of Oucherstoun in Ballintrodo, 8/ money foresaid and multures, one diet of a plough in winter, one diet of a harrow in Lent, and 7 diets with a reaping hook in autumn, together with the load of a horse between Tempillstoun and Ballintrodo, which is commonly called Listounlade, and the said William giving to the servants foresaid, on the days of their service, their breakfast, and at supper to each of them a pound of cheese and a peckkan of wheat.[2] I have quoted this lease at length, because of the careful way in which it provides for the entertainment of the labourers. It shows that the Knights were ready to show hospitality to churls as well as to kings.

The next Preceptor, Sir George Dundas, is said by Chalmers to have been "the schoolfellow of Hector Boece at Paris," and a man of learning.[3] Sir William Knollis resigned the Preceptorate in his favour in 1504.[4] In 1508 he has a Royal Warrant from James IV. for a Letter of Admission "under his grete sele to his lovit familiar servitoure, George Dundas, Knicht of ye Roddis, admittand him to ye temporalitie of ye preceptorie of Torphichen of the ordour of Sancte Johnne, liand wytin his realme, and of all and sundry ye landis, rentis, and possessiones of the samyn quhatsumever, the aith of fidelitie ressavit fra him be the Kingis grace of before, of the quhilk Preceptory, the said Schir George is providit be ye hede house of ye Rodis as is mare largely contenit in the provision maid to him yerupone."[5]

---

[1] Diet = day's work.

[2] *Hist. MSS. Commission*, 3rd Report, p. 414.

[3] Chalmers' *Caledonia*, vol. iv., p. 875.

[4] M'Call's *Parish of Mid-Calder*, p. 254.

[5] *Acts and Decrees Supreme Civil Court*, quoted by Riddell, *Scottish Peerages*, vol. i., p. 88.

Notwithstanding this warrant he had considerable trouble in getting possession of the temporality of his office, for in the year 1515 it appears from the Acts of the Lords of Council and Session that "Alexander Stewart, postulate of Inchiffray, had intruded himself in the Preceptory of Torphichen notwithstanding that Sir George Dundas is lawfully promoted to the same."[1] In the end, having at his back all the influence of the Papal Court, he successfully asserts his rights. He was, like his predecessors, ready to vindicate the privileges of the Order against all parties attempting to infringe them. The following excerpt from the Acts of the Lords of Council is an instance of this: "The Lordis of Consale continuies the suite rasit at ye instance of George, Lord St. Johns, against ye Provost and Bailzies of Strieveling, for ye taking furthe ane Tempill land in ye said burgh of ane callit Thomas Bynny, yr., throu brekand ye preveledge of Sanct John's as is alledgit, lyk as at mair length is contenit in ye said summonds."[2] Here we have the privilege of sanctuary claimed for the Order. The result of the case is unknown, but the tendency of the times was to restrict the right of girth or sanctuary to a few well-defined spots, and thus to limit its application as being in its nature inimical to the dispensation of justice.[3] There is no doubt of the fact that this privilege attached to the Preceptory at Torphichen and to an area of a mile round it. The stone which is said to mark the centre of this area is still to be seen in the churchyard. But it is doubtful whether it attached to all the property of the Order, and I do not think this can be proved. Mr. Riddell quotes an interesting case in this city which goes to show that the property of the Knights here had not the privilege. He says: "On the 13th of June, 1553, the Prior and Convent of 'ye Freris Predicatouris of ye cietie of Glasgow' pursue the Magistrates 'havaris and keeparis of William Culquhoune,' and Mr. Stevin Betoune, Chamberlain of the Castle of Glasgow, upon this ground—'yat quhare in all tymes byane, sen ye fundation of yair saide place, or past memor of man, yair saide place hes

[1] M'Call's *Parish of Mid-Calder*, p. 255.

[2] Maidment's *Abstracts of Charters in Chartulary of Torphichen*, p. 3.

See Robertson's *Scotland under her Early Kings*, vol. ii., p. 47.

bene privilegit wyt privileges of sanctuary and girthe, at ye leist for recent and suddand crymes, and sua reverendlie observit yat it was never yet violat be any maner of persone yat can be rememberit, quhill lastly upon ye third day of Junii instant, efter yat ye said Williame Culquhoune and Hew Lockhart of suddantlie had ilk ane hurt uytheris wytin ye said cietie, ye said Williame fled into ye saide place and sanctuary for girth, being yerintill traisting to haif bruikit ye privilege of ye samyn, the kin and freyndis of ye said Hew came to ye saide place, and be fource and way of deid tuke him furthe of ye porch Kirk dure yerof, deliverit him to ye provest and baillies of ye said cietie and chalmerlane of ye Castell yerof, quha hes, and wythhaldis him, and will not restore him againe to ye fredome and privilege of ye said Sanctuary wytout yai be compellit, to ye grait hurt of ye freedome and privilege of halie Kirk, violatioune of ye said sanctuarie, nane uyer being in ye west parities of the realme fra Torphiching west, bot ye said place allanerlie, sen ye tulye wes commitit upone suddantie, and no partie is slane be ayer.' The defenders appeared and 'desyrit ye said Prior and Convent to schaw yair said privilege of girthe and sanctuary.' This is thought reasonable, and as the pursuers were unable to prove that any such right had ever been granted to them the court assoilzied the defenders."[1] From the pursuers' statement it thus appears that Torphichen was the only sanctuary available in the sixteenth century for the West of Scotland, and as no mention is made of the right being attached at that date to the tenement in Stockwell Street, or the lands in the neighbourhood of Glasgow belonging to the Hospital, it is a legitimate inference that the right by that date had been lost.

To return to Sir George Dundas. In 1517 he has to take proceedings against Mr. Patrick Knollis, son of the late Preceptor, for wrongous detention of 40 oxen belonging to the Order. In the same year he concludes a treaty with England. He seems to have died in 1533, as in that year his successor was appointed.

Sir Walter Lindsay, who thus became Lord of St. John, was admitted into the Order in 1525. He is said to have been the fifth son of John

[1] Riddell's *Remarks upon Scottish Peerage Law*, p. 153.

Lindsay, justiciar of the north of Scotland, and belonged to the noble family of Crawfurd and Lindsay.[1] His name and fame have been enshrined in Scottish poetry:

> "Thrie Lordis to me sal be Executouris.
> Lindesayis all thrie in surname of renoun:
> Of my Testament they sall have haill the curis;
> To put my mind till execution.
> That surname failyeit never to the Croun,
> Na mair will thay to me I am richt sure,
> Quhilk is the caus that I give thame the cure.
>
> "First David Erll of Craufuird wise and wicht,
> And Johne Lord Lindesay my maister special,
> The thrid sal be ane nobill travellit Knicht,
> Quhilk knawis the coistis of feistis funeral:
> The wise Sir Walter Lindesay they him call;
> Lord of Sanct Johne, and Knicht of Torfichane,
> Be sey and land ane vailyeand capitane."

These lines are from the "Testament of Squyer Meldrum," by Sir David Lindsay of the Mount.[2]

Sir Walter rose to be Justice-General of Scotland, and appears to have caused a monument to be erected at Torphichen to his uncle and predecessor, Sir George Dundas. Two slabs are built into the west wall of the transepts which have formed part of it. One of them has an inscription which is usually rendered thus: "Walterus Lyndesay, Justiciarius Generalis de Scocia ac Principalis Praeceptor Torphichensis, 1538";[3] but on careful examination it proves to be: "Valterus Lyndesay huius successor et ex sorore nepos hoc monumentum fieri fecit, 1538."[4]

---

[1] M'Call's *Parish of Mid-Calder*, p. 255.

[2] Lindsay's *Works* (Laing's edition), vol. i., p. 211. Pitscottie (vol. ii., p. 393), in speaking of Sir Walter Lindsay, says "he was well beseen and practisit in wars baith in Italy and Spain, and had oft-times foughten against the Turks in defence of the Christians, being in company with the Lord of the Rhodes, and there he was made Knight for his valiant acts, and thereafter came in Scotland and servit the King, and came in great credit with his Grace."

[3] Monteith's *Theater of Mortality* (reprint, 1834), p. 274.

[4] I am indebted to Mr. George Neilson, F.S.A.Scot., for deciphering the above inscription.

At the beginning of this paper I spoke of the Church as showing features of sixteenth century work. In 1540 King James V. confirms a feu charter by Walter, Lord of St. John, Knight of Jerusalem, Preceptor of Torphichen, in favour of John Tennent and Mariote Atkinsoune, his wife, of the lands of Listounschelis. Tennent is called *familiaris servitor regis*, namely, an official of the Royal Household, and the consideration for granting the deed is sums of money advanced for the repairing of the house and church of Torphichen and other favours.[1] Both the house and the church had been getting renovated, and John Tennent had provided the cash. His *quid pro quo* is the estate of Listounschelis. In the Register of the Great Seal several Charters by Sir Walter Lindsay—one of them dated at Torphichen, 20th September, 1540—are confirmed.[2]

Sir James Sandilands, in 1540, has the Royal License to proceed to the Master of the House of Rhodes at Malta, or otherwise obtain from him the right to the next vacancy. He had to wait six years before the holder died; but in 1547 he became Preceptor, and his presentation was confirmed by the Pope. In 1550 he was invested with the Preceptory "by delivery of the Chalice, Missal, and other ornaments of the High Altar, and the Keys of the Church," representing the spirituality, and obtaining sasine of the temporalities by delivery of earth and stone in the Court of the Place of Torphichen.[3]

This Knight was the second son of Sir James Sandilands of Calder, and, having like his father espoused the reformed doctrines, he in 1563 resigned into the Queen's hands the different lands, baronies, and other properties belonging to the Preceptory, and received a Charter from the Crown regranting them to him united into one Barony of Torphichen.

---

[1] *Reg. Mag. Sig.*, 28 Jac. V., No. 2204.

[2] *Ibid.*, 29 Jac. V., 2607, 2680, 2920. There is a special feature about these Charters. They bear to be granted with the consent of Friar Philip Villiers de L'isle Adam, Master of the Hospital of St. John. He was Grand Master of the Order at Rhodes and Malta from 1521 to 1534. Scotland was drawn closer to the supreme authority after the suppression of the Order in England by Henry VIII. That suppression was keenly felt, and one effect was to make the Grand Master in Malta and the Knights in Scotland desirous to feu out their landed property here, so as to secure themselves as far as possible against forfeiture in the uncertain future.

[3] Dr. Stuart's Report, *Hist. MSS. Commission*, 1871.

Dr. Stuart reports that "the Queen's regrant of the Baronies of the Preceptory in 1563 did not contain words creating a peerage, but ever since its date the Lord of John and his heirs have been peers of the realm, and in 1633 it was found in Parliament that the 'title, honour, and dignitie of Lord Torphichen is annexit to the meane remainer,' or middle portion of the Barony surrounding the place."[1]

The rise of the Sandilands family is a most interesting chapter in Scottish history, but I must not enter on it at present. I would mention that Sir James Sandilands, in order to get the Charter in favour of himself and his heirs, agreed to pay down 10,000 Crowns of the Sun, and to pay also an annual feu-duty of 500 merks. One of his successors stated that "a great part of that money numerat in gold and silver was borrowed from Timothy Curneoli, an Italian gentleman of the Preceptor's acquaintance at Genoa, and a banquier, resident in Scotland for the time."[2]

This accounts for the rapid way in which the large estates of the Order were dissipated.

Before concluding, I wish to say a few words regarding the estates of the Hospitallers, more particularly in this part of the country.

In the case of Leith *v.* Officers of State, 31st January, 1782, which had reference to the right of patronage to the church of Towie, Aberdeenshire, an original rental of the Temple lands in Scotland, prepared by Sir Walter Lindsay when Preceptor—no doubt for transmission to Malta—was produced. It has since disappeared. Appended to it was this docquet: "This rental is Schir Valter Lyndsea's hande-wryt, and syn his decese var never alterit, nor lang time afor. (signed) James Sandilands of Torphichen." This signature is that of the last Preceptor. Mr. Maidment has printed from Leith's case the statement made regarding the Temple lands.[3] From it one sees the extensive nature of their

[1] *Hist. MSS. Commission*, 3rd Report, 1871. Compare Riddell's *Scottish Peerages*, i., p. 90.

[2] Information for John, Lord Torphichen, etc., p. 7, Maidment's *Templaria*.

[3] *Abstract of Charters recorded in the Chartulary of Torphichen*, p. 7. The words "Temple lands" are used to indicate possessions of both Orders (*Terrae Templariae, quasi Terrae concessae Militibus Templi Solomonis*), and this practice has given rise to confusion.

possessions. The following are excerpts. "*Imprimis*—The Barony of Torphichen (*Baronia de Torphichen*); the Church of Torphichen (*Ecclesia de Torphichen*); the Barony of Thankerton (Lanarkshire); the Barony of Denny (Stirlingshire); the Barony of Auld-Liston; the Barony of Tempill de Ballintrado, with Paistoun and the lands of Twaddile; the Church of Tempill (Mid Lothian); the Barony of Mary Culter, *ultra montes* (Kincardineshire); the Church of Mary Culter." Against it is this note, presumably by the Preceptor, the quaintness of which makes one regret the loss of the original: "The Kirk of Mary Culter was wont to be sett for £22 bye the Mainis; now mony of the teinds are in my ain hands, and pais better." "The lands of Koncraig and Fyntulie in Strathearn, Galtno in Galloway, St. Boswells in Lauderdale, Dagna in Nithsdale, the Church of Kylbathoc, the Churches of Obin and Tullic, the Church of Inchynan. 'It has been in use to pay bot £20, but it is better an it wer out of the hand of the Laird of Cruickstoune.'"

Turning to our own city, it is well known that there was a property on the west side of Stockwell Street belonging to the Hospitallers. It is thus described in William Hegait's first Protocol Book:[1] "A tenement of Temple land, with yard and pertinents lying within the Sheriffdom of Lanark, in the City of Glasgow, in that street called the Stockuell, on the west side thereof, between the lands or tenement of John Johnstoune on the south and the lands or tenement of William Allasoune on the north."

In the adjoining Burgh of Rutherglen there was property belonging to the Knights, and in the neighbouring County of Renfrew the lands of Caplerig were Temple lands, and also the property in the Newton of Mearns, known now as Malletsheugh.[2] Nearer Glasgow, on the south-east, we may name the Temple croft of Cathkin. There were several properties in Dumbartonshire and Stirlingshire. The above are but a few, out of many referred to in the Chartulary and elsewhere, as the list is too long for quotation in full. Almost every county helped to swell the revenues of the House of Torphichen.

---

[1] *Glasgow Protocols*, edited by R. Renwick, vol. i., No. 58.

[2] *Reg. Monas. de Passelet*, p. 379.

It has been generally supposed that the estate of Jordanhill, having either on it or in its immediate neighbourhood such place-names as Knightswood and Temple, was partly or wholly the property of the Knights of St. John. An examination of the titles confirms this supposition. The earliest deed in existence among the Jordanhill writs is the extract Special Retour of Cornelius Crawfurde of Jordanhill to his father, Hugh Crawfurde, of date 23rd August, 1625.[1] Therein the lands are described as the five pound lands of old extent of Jordanhill, with the tower, fortalice, manor place, houses, gardens, tofts, crofts, parts, pendicles, and pertinents of the same; and also the six shilling and eight penny land called Tempil lands of Rywrae, with the pertinents; along with the thirteen shilling and four penny land of old extent of Quilt, with the pertinents all lying within the parish and shire of Renfrew. Quilt is the Gaelic *Coillte*, 'woods,' and thus is the same as Cults in Aberdeen and Galloway, and the early name may be presented to us now in Knightswood.[2] Regarding the word Rywrae, it may, I think, be *Righ-reidh*, or King's meadow, and thus might connect us with the days of King Rederich and St. Mungo. Be that as it may, there is little doubt that these lands belonged, before the Reformation, to the Hospitallers; and the names Jordanhill, Temple, Knightswood, all point to a fact which the early titles confirm.

We have thus glanced at the career of this celebrated Order in Scotland, and I am sure that we must all feel, with every one who has handled the subject, great regret that the material for a thorough investigation is so scanty.

---

[1] I am indebted to Messrs. Peattie, Macintyre, & Laird for access to the Jordanhill title deeds.

[2] Perthshire has also lands of the name—*Terrae de Mekle-Quylt et Snago, in baronia sua de Capet, vic Perth. Reg. Mag. Sig.*, 2 Jac. IV. (1490).

No. IX.

TWO CHAMPIONS OF THE COVENANT.

BY

R. HERBERT STORY, D.D., LL.D., F.S.A. Scot.,

PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW; VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY.

[*Read at a Meeting of the Society held on 18th March, 1897.*]

During the persecuting years of Charles II. and James VII. the rigid Covenanting "Societies," which would have nothing to do with the ministers who accepted the Indulgence, subscribed funds to defray the expense of sending able and zealous young men to be trained for the ministry in Holland, and, when duly qualified, ordained by a friendly Dutch "Classis" or Presbytery. Among these youths was Renwick, the last martyr of the Covenant. After his execution the Societies were left without any ordained minister, until Thomas Lining, or Linning, and William Boyd, who had received ordination abroad, returned to this country. They and Alexander Shields, who had been a prisoner on the Bass, and was, later in life, the author of *A Hind Let Loose*, and finally chaplain to the ill-starred colonists at Darien, resolved to seek admission to the National Church, when it was re-established on its old Presbyterian basis, after the Revolution of 1688. The General Assembly of 1690 agreed to receive their petition. Their orders were valid; their submission to the authority of the reconstituted Court was satisfactory, and they were received into the Church. But their reception was viewed with gloomy



Flag of the Rev. John Hepburn, 1715.

disapproval by the staunch remnant of the Covenanting, or—as they were commonly called—Cameronian, Societies, who felt themselves deserted by their leaders, and thus deprived of that which they regarded as essential to their religious well-being—the offices of a regular ministry. Sixteen years passed away, and the Societies were still as sheep without a shepherd, when, in 1706, they found a man after their own heart around whom they could rally, and of whose services they could avail themselves.

This was John Macmillan, minister of Balmaghie in Galloway. That parish lies in the very heart of the Covenanting country, where Turner and Grierson and Claverhouse had harried and hunted the hapless children of the Covenant. The wrongs and outrages, of which the memory still is vivid among the glens and moors, "where round the graves of the martyrs the whaups are crying," had burnt into the hearts of the people a passion of independence—an enthusiasm for any one who identified himself with the assertion of principles, for which the friends and kindred they had known and loved had endured persecution and faced death.

Macmillan (whose history has been recently related in a delightful volume, entitled *A Cameronian Apostle*, by his present successor in the charge of Balmaghie, the Rev. H. M. B. Reid) was a man of strong character, commanding personality, masterful will, and undoubted genius; above all—to use his biographer's words—"the very blood in his veins was Covenanting blood." As a boy and lad he had been in close intercourse with the Societies. When, as a young man, he took his degree, and passed through the Edinburgh Divinity Hall, he did not anticipate that his entering on the career of a licentiate of the Church would make the maintenance of his early connection impossible. He loved the ministry. The only avenue to it lay through ordination to a parish; for now the Societies no longer sought to train their own candidates, and had fallen, to a large extent, under the dominion of lay persons, of character and standing similar to those known in some parts of the Highlands to this day as "The Men." On the unanimous call of the parishioners, he became minister of Balmaghie in 1701. But ere long he began to realize that the position of a parish minister and member of a Presbytery was one which an ardent sympathizer with the Societies could

not conveniently hold. The oath of allegiance to Queen Anne (an uncovenanted sovereign) was an insuperable stumbling block; so were the Church's failure to assert the *jus divinum* of Presbytery, and her toleration of those "curates" who still remained in their charges. The most fatal grievance lay in the non-assertion of the *jus divinum*, and in the recognition of any title, on the State's part, to exact oaths of allegiance from the clergy, or to lay down rules about the meetings of their ecclesiastical courts. A conflict with his Presbytery, which began in April 1703, resulted in December in his deposition. How he defied the Presbytery, and in spite of all the fulminations of the Church and the very ineffective interposition of the arm of "Caesar," remained in his manse and kirk at Balmaghie, supported by the enthusiastic sympathy and the physical force of his parishioners and his friends in the Societies, for more than twenty years, is too long a tale for me to tell here. I speak of him in connection with Hepburn, because his history, more conspicuously than any other, illustrates the peculiar conditions, ecclesiastical and social, of the period in which Hepburn, to whom his relation was close, played his part.

The Valley of the Urr lies next to that of the Dee, and the deposed Macmillan found a congenial spirit in the occupant of the neighbouring manse. He, too, was regarded as a faithful and true witness by the Societies; for though he had accepted a charge in the uncovenanted Kirk, he had, like Macmillan, denounced the oath of allegiance, and employed an inexhaustible energy in testifying against the host of defections, backslidings, and carnal compliances which had defiled the National Sanctuary. Hepburn was an older man than Macmillan. He was the son of a Morayshire farmer, and, studying at Aberdeen, had taken his M.A. in King's College in 1669, and had been ordained in London, by an English Presbytery, in 1678. As early as 1680 the people of Urr had given him a "call" to labour among them in the Lord—the minister of the parish being then John Lyon, an Episcopalian, whose services they repudiated, and whom they ultimately rabbled out, after the Revolution. What effect Hepburn gave to this call does not appear; but that he exercised his ministry, there or elsewhere, so as to incur the resentment of the

authorities, may be inferred from his being declared fugitive in May 1684. However, he became, in a regular way, the minister of Urr in 1689. In this position he is not unfairly described by Mr. Hill Burton as one of the most merciless of the thorns in the side of the Established Church. "A more troublesome fellow-labourer was never endured by men desirous to live in peace and comfort, and do such practical good as lay in their way. No soothing compliments, no gentle remonstrances, no numerical superiority, or commanding pomp of Church judicatory, could stop his testimony, or prevent him from calling his gentler and more accommodating brethren self-seekers, who left their sheep to the ravenous wolf, and charging them with a multitude of crimes, which, beginning in toleration and laxity, mounted up to blasphemy and perjury in the abandonment of the Covenant." With a curious mixture of devotion to the Church, and of detestation of the shortcomings which hindered its realizing the ideal which he loved, he clung to his pastorate, while he flouted the authority and the principles of the judicatories to which he had vowed obedience.

At last these judicatories had to take him in hand, and he was suspended by the General Assembly of 1696, because of his "repeated irregularities and his failure to promise to walk orderly," and to appear, as he had been summoned to do, at the bar of that Court. Thereafter he was libelled before the Privy Council, and sequestered from his parish for three years, during which he was incarcerated for a time in Edinburgh Castle, and for a time in Stirling. According to contemporary pamphlets, his irrepressible energy found a vent in his preaching, through the bars of his prison windows, to such as would listen, among whom were sometimes devotees who, says Mr. Hill Burton, had "travelled from his own peculiar Western district, to drink at the pure fountain of Covenanted truth."

His suspension was removed in 1699, and he returned to his parish, not a whit intimidated or cowed in spirit, and lost no time in identifying himself with Macmillan, exchanging pulpits with him, scouting his deposition as null and void, intruding into neighbouring parishes, and preaching and baptizing without their pastors' leave; declaring that he was under obligation to testify against the Church's treatment of the minister of Balmaghie, that the Church "had gone off her foundation,"

that "the oath of allegiance was a black oath," and the demand for it insufferable Erastianism. The usual result followed all this wrongheaded and voluble vehemence. After sundry processes in the inferior courts, the General Assembly of 1704 passed an Act "against schisms and disorders, and anent Mr. John Macmillan and Mr. John Hepburn," in which the case of the latter was referred to the Commission, empowered to proceed against him, if necessary, "with the censures of the Church."

The Commission reported to the next Assembly that in view of his "rebellion and broken promises," he ought to be deposed, and deposed he was accordingly. He was, however, in the exercise of an almost excessive tolerance, reponed two years later; after which his course was quite as eccentric and arbitrary as it had been before. He became the centre and oracle of those peculiar people who, disapproving of the whole course of the policy of the Church of the Revolution, yet would not separate from her. They might be unmanageable and headstrong, but they would not be schismatics; they would not form a new communion, but remained a sort of distinct community within the Church—in the Church, yet not wholly of it.

It was here that Hepburn's path finally diverged from that of Macmillan. The Revolution Settlement, he pointed out in his *Humble Pleadings for the Good Old Way*, had split up the Covenanters into three parties—the party of the ministers who, leaving the Societies to themselves, conformed on its own terms to the Established Church; the party of the extreme Cameronians, who would on no terms recognize the Courts of the Church which had renounced the Covenant; and the party who—to use Hepburn's own words—"judged it most like to Scripture pattern to own what was good in both Church and State, and to protest and bear witness against the defections of both by pleading in face of judicatories for redress of grievances." Faithful to this principle, he remained in the Church, and pleaded and protested and testified to his heart's content; while Macmillan, after long and defiant retention of his place at Balmaghie, left it, to become the head of the irreconcilable Societies, and thus the founder of the separatist body, which took the title of the "Reformed Presbyterian Church." The "Macmillanites" became a sect; the "Hebronians," as

they were called, were gradually absorbed in the general body of the peaceable and constitutional Presbyterians. Hepburn's course was obviously the wiser; but it was, to a man of his temperament, not the easier; and no doubt his explosive utterances and demonstrations, frequent as they were, acted, in some degree, as the safety valves of the stern self-restraint which held in check his Covenanting ardours. He is said to have been strangely fervent in his prayers and powerful in his preaching. He was inexhaustible in the appeals and statements of grievances, with which he bombarded the General Assembly. He collected all the books in the parish that he thought savoured of popery, and burnt them in a great bonfire on the Corse Hill. And, finally, when he believed the Protestant Constitution in Church and State was in danger, he drilled his male parishioners, and marched them, 320 strong, himself and a resonant drummer at their head, to Dumfries.

This was in 1715, when the tidings of Mar's rising had alarmed the Borders. Hepburn had deplored the Revolution Settlement; he had even more grievously deplored and abominated the "sinful and sorrowful union"; and, perhaps, worst of all, the restoration of patronage in 1712; but more hopelessly ruinous than all these put together would be the fall of the Protestant dynasty and the return from exile of the faithless and bloody House of Stuart; so he girded on his claymore, unfurled his banner, and took the field like a man. There appears to have arisen at this time some latent doubt of his integrity, which I cannot see was justified. Not improbably some among the Societies may have thought that if the Jacobites prevailed, the Kirk might wring from them amendments of the Revolution Settlement, which neither Whig nor Tory had hitherto been ready to concede. But, as far as one can see, Hepburn entertained no such idea; nor was he likely to entertain it, his hatred of popery and dread of the principles of the House of Stuart being what they were. Suspicion was roused, apparently, by his action on approaching Dumfries. The town was in daily apprehension of an attack from the Jacobite force under Lord Kenmure; and when, on the 31st October, it was known that Hepburn and his 320 parishioners were three miles off in Kirkmahoe, Bailie Gilchrist and the Laird of Bargaly hastened to meet them, and make sure of their help in the defence of the town. But Hepburn would not commit himself;

and though he led his force to the Nith, and took up a strong position on Corbelly Hill overlooking Devorgilla's Bridge, he informed the Bailie and the Laird that his people "had no freedom in their conscience to fight in defence of the Constitution of Church and State, as established since the sinful union." The Provost next went out and tried his powers of persuasion, offering the men of Urr any post within the burgh which they chose to take up; but to no purpose, and he had to return to his pale burghers with nothing more satisfactory than a paper—unsigned—containing sundry impossible conditions, on which alone the 320 would enter Dumfries.

The popular mind may have jumped to the conclusion that these sticklers for conscience were waiting to see whether Lord Kenmure or the townspeople would show the better fight; but their scruples were only the natural outcome of their own crotchety and inveterate prejudices; and, no doubt, if the Jacobite attack had taken place, they would have promptly been in the thick of it, and on the right side.

That the feeling of the town was friendly to them was proved by the supplies that were freely sent up the hill for their refreshment. Before sunset, on the 1st of November, it was known that Kenmure was "on and awa'," and had gone towards England, without stopping to meddle with Dumfries; whereupon Hepburn, like the King of France, marched down the hill, and so home to Urr. This was his last public demonstration.

His flag was furled and laid by in his manse, whence, after a repose of 182 years, the kindness of the Rev. David Frew, the present minister, has allowed it to emerge for our inspection. It measures six feet one inch by four feet two and a half. The material is cream-coloured silk, with a groove of thicker cloth at the one end, for the insertion of the staff. The legend, in capital letters, is "For the Lord of Hosts."

Hepburn lived for eight years after this bootless enterprise; his life, like that of many another turbulent and restless idealist, taking a "sober colouring" towards its close. He devoted himself to his cure of souls, and forbore protests and testimonies. In February 1723 the good Wodrow writes, in his gossiping way, "Old Mr. Hepburn is a-dying, and they say presses union and peace much." In this charitable frame he entered on his rest not long after, in his quiet manse in the pleasant Vale of Urr.

No. X.

ST. KESSOG AND HIS CULTUS IN SCOTLAND.

BY

JAMES MURRAY MACKINLAY, M.A. F.S.A. LOND. and SCOT.

[*Read at a Meeting of the Society held on 18th March, 1897.*]

WHAT St. Maelrubha was to the west coast of Ross-shire, and St. Baldred to East Lothian, St. Kessog was to the district about Loch Lomond. Though of Irish extraction Kessog can fairly claim to be a Scottish saint. Indeed one tradition represents him as a native of the Lennox.[1] It is difficult to state with precision the time when St. Kessog flourished. There is a difference of forty years between the date of his death as given by Dempster and that given by Camerarius, the one fixing it in 520 A.D., the other in 560.[2] His day in the Calendar is tenth of March. In the Dunkeld Litany, believed by Bishop Forbes to be a production of the early sixteenth century, St. Kessog is invoked among the holy bishops under the name of Makkessoch.[3] We do not know what manner of man he was as regards personal appearance, but one can infer from this fact that he was counted worthy of respect and esteem. The honorific prefix "Ma," or "Mo," often occurs in connection with the names of early saints. It means literally "my," and is used as a term of endearment.

---

[1] Fraser's *Chiefs of Colquhoun*, vol. ii., p. 54.

[2] Dempster's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, vol. ii., p. 454, and Camerarius's *De Scotorum Fortitudine*, lib. iii., cap. 4. Dempster says *Floruit*. He evidently meant *Obiit*.

[3] *Kalendars of Scottish Saints*, pref. p. 58.

Thus to cite only two other instances, we find St. Charmaig of Islay styled MacCharmig, and St. Wolloch of Glass in Strathdeveron Makwolok. In like manner Kessog and Mackessog are one and the same, though the prefix has been mistaken for the Gaelic "Mac," a son, by Dempster, who, in regard to Mackessog, says: "Id nomen sonat filium Kessogi." Dempster also has "Kessogus seu Bessogus," but Bessogus is clearly the mistake of some scribe. So much for the name of our saint.

In the annals of early missionary zeal, Kessog occupies chronologically a middle place between St. Patrick and St. Columba. If 520 was the date of his death, Kessog passed away thirty-seven years after the death of the former, and one year before the birth of the latter. If 560 was the date, Kessog and our own Kentigern were contemporaries for some forty years. There is no ancient life of our saint. In its absence we must mainly depend on the meagre and not always consistent narrations of the *Aberdeen Martyrology* and the *Aberdeen Breviary* in the sixteenth century, and of Thomas Dempster and David Camerarius in the seventeenth. Let us examine these in order.

(A.) The *Martyrology of Aberdeen* has this entry: The sixth of the Ides of March. In Scotland at the Church of Luss, the birthday (*Natalis*) of the Blessed Kessog the bishop, of which church he himself was the patron, where having been venerated he is distinguished by miracles, nor is he undeservedly venerated in lands where he sought a heavenly mode of life (*ubi vivendi modum quesivit in celis*).[1]

(B.) The *Breviary* of Aberdeen has a collect and six lections relating to St. Kessog. These lections may be thus summarized: "1st. Kessog, a distinguished Confessor of Christ, derived his origin and name from the city of Mamonia (*ex Mamonensi civitate*), and from the stem of the illustrious Kings of Ireland. From his earliest years he was distinguished for miracles, and was a help to many in sickness. I may remark in passing that Mamonia is believed to be Munster, and the city Cashel. The compilers of the *Acta Sanctorum* seem to think that the name Mamonia has been by mistake given to the city instead of to the province

[1] *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, vol. ii., p. 262.

(*nam Mamonia civitas in Hibernia nulla est*). The phrase (*ex Mamonensi civitate*), however, does not necessarily imply this.

"2nd. Kessog's father, the King, invited his co-rulers (*conreges*) to a feast, and asked them to bring their sons.

"3rd. The said Kings with two of their sons came to the King's city, and were welcomed with the sound of trumpets and other musical instruments (*cum tubarum clangore ac musicalium instrumentorum sonitu*).

"4th. Kessog and the two sons of the King fell into a lake, and Kessog alone was saved from drowning.

"5th. A certain man, Elinthus by name, fearing lest a greater evil should arise, sought to mitigate the grief of the Kings, but they vowed to burn the city and ruin the kingdom.

"6th. Kessog prostrated himself in prayer to God (*in oratione ad Deum se prostravit*). An angel appeared and said 'rise up quickly, for the Lord has heard thy prayers, and the Kings' sons are come to life.' Thereafter Kessog with humility and joy delivered them alive to their fathers. Other miracles were wrought. At length Kessog passed to Heaven, and with solemn funeral rites was laid in the church of Luss, and there he rests."

(C.) I come now to Dempster, who refers to Kessog in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, published in 1627, and in his *Menologium Scotorum*, published five years earlier. In the *Historia* he alludes to our saint under the names of Kessagus and Makkessagus in different parts of the book as if they were not the same person; for the date of the one he gives as 700 (DCC), and of the other as 520 (DXX). It is possible, however, to remove the difficulty by holding that DCC was inserted by mistake for DXX. This is what he says about Kessogus: "Sailing from Scotland into Ireland, athirst for a solitary and monastic life, he gave himself wholly to the Lord." After referring to his merits, he says: "in Cathenesia pleraeque aedes sacrae loquuntur, et pluribus recolunt vicini. Floruit anno DCC." Whatever may be the precise meaning of the obscure Latin in this passage we can gather at least from it that, according to Dempster, the cultus of Kessog was popular in Caithness and its neighbourhood.

With regard to *Makkessagus*, Dempster writes, "St. Makkessagus governed

the Scots in the Episcopal dignity, being chosen, as I think, from the order of the Culdees. A Church erected to him in the Lennox, near the Earldom of Menteith, is called the Church of the Port, famous for markets and large assemblages of people. He wrote a compilation of prayers and a catechism for neophytes. He flourished in the year 520."[1] Dempster's next reference to be quoted occurs in his *Menologium*, as cited in *Acta Sanctorum* under March tenth. After stating Kessog's connection with Levinia, he says: "Levinia is another name for Lennox at the end of ancient Northumbria, whose town of Dumbarton is sufficiently well known. But at a distance thence in the North of Scotland (*in Boreali Scotia*) are the Boyne district and the Boyne camp beyond the Buchan province (*Boina regio et Boinum castrum ultra Buchaniam provinciam*)."

(D.) The "Boina regio" of Dempster forms a link with Kessog's biography as given by Camerarius, who supplies the following information in his *De Scotorum Fortitudine*[2]: "On the same day (10th March) St. Makkessog, who is also called Kessog, in the province of Boin in Scotland (*in Boina Scotiae provincia*), celebrated by the glory of miracles, who was in great favour with Congall Second, King of the Scots. He performed many things to the glory of God, and for a public example. He was also the author of concord and peace to many of the principal men. Congall, in particular, was so influenced by him towards piety, that by the moderation of his soul and the probity of his manners the King seemed to vie with the monks themselves." Mackessog died in the province of Boin in the year 560. It is significant that there is still a district known as Boyne, in Banffshire, to the south-east of Cullen, though whether it can fairly be localized as "ultra Buchanian provinciam" depends on our geographical stand-point.

Some additional light is to be had on the career of St. Kessog from an Irish source, viz. from the *Martyrology of Donegal*. We there find, under March eleventh, the name of Moshennock of Beitheach, and this,

---

[1] Sir William Fraser's translation in *Chiefs of Colquhoun*, vol. ii., p. 54. The original occurs in *Historia Ecclesiastica*, tom. ii., p. 454.

[2] Liber, iii., cap. iv.

we are informed, is another name for Senanus. Dr. Todd, the editor of the work, along with Bishop Reeves, adds a note to the effect that the saint in question is the same as the Kessog of the *Aberdeen Breviary*. With respect to Senanus, Bishop Moran, in his *Irish Saints in Great Britain* (p. 178), thus writes: "St. Senanus, patron of Iniscattery Island, is honoured in Scotland under the name of Kessog and Moshenoc. At Eives (Ewes), in Eskdale, he is joint-patron with St. Cuthbert, and he was venerated at Achdashenaigh and Killenach, in Mull, and at Kilmahunah in Cantyre." Iniscattery, otherwise Inis-Cathaigh, lies in the Shannon, near its mouth. A church was founded on it by Senanus about the year 540.[1] According to the *Martyrology of Donegal* (p. 69), St. Patrick foretold the greatness of Senan, and prophesied that he would occupy the island of Inis-Cathaigh. Before Senan came the island was the haunt of a monster that injured people and cattle; but the saint expelled the monster, and blessed the island. His various miracles are narrated in *Lives of Saints from the Book of Lismore*, edited by Dr. Whitley Stokes, where we read that St. Senan confronted the monster, and subdued its ferocity by the sign of the cross. In Irish hagiology, Senan occurs repeatedly as a name. Indeed no fewer than twenty-two Senans are commemorated in the *Martyrology of Donegal*, a set of saints not readily distinguishable from one another.

How are we to piece together these fragments of a life into a consistent whole? In looking at the biographical details given above, one is struck with the extent of country connected with St. Kessog, for it is indeed a far cry from Iniscattery to Caithness. The range of Kessog's influence, however, is quite in keeping with what is narrated regarding certain other early missionaries, such as Brendan and Fergus. Briefly stated, the facts are probably these. Our saint was born at Cashel in Munster, and spent his life as a missionary partly in Ireland, but mainly in Scotland. In all likelihood he passed and repassed between the two countries. Dumbartonshire was his chief centre; and whether or not he died there, he found a grave at Luss within its borders. There is no

[1] Reeves's *Culdees*, p. 25.

doubt that Kessog was specially revered in the Lennox. According to Dempster, in his *Menologium*, as quoted in the *Acta Sanctorum*, Kessog's name was invoked by the warriors of the district, who evidently regarded him as a good representative of the Church militant. Dempster adds: "The saint himself is depicted in military costume, with arrows and a bent bow (*ipse militari habitu cum sagittis arcu tenso depingitur*)." In mediaeval times the wood of the yew was highly prized in the making of bows, and, if the yew trees still to be seen on Inch Lonaig in Loch Lomond show what trees flourished in Kessog's time, the saint had not far to go to get a good weapon. Inch-ta-vannach, *i.e.* "the island of the monk's house"—now part of Luss parish—is said to have been the spot where St. Kessog took up his abode. The highest part is called "Tom-na-clog," or the "knoll of the bell," a reminiscence of the monastery afterwards founded on the island.[1] Even though we hold that Luss comes from the Gaelic *lus*, 'a plant' or 'herb,' we do not need to connect the name of the parish with a local legend thus narrated by Sir William Fraser, in his *Chiefs of Colquhoun* (vol. ii., p. 54): St. Kessog suffered martyrdom in a foreign land, and his remains, being embalmed with sweet herbs, were brought for interment to the church of his native place, which then bore the name of *Clachandhu*. One of the herbs sprung up from his grave, and spread itself over the wall of the church, a circumstance from which the parish took the name of *Lus*, a word which, in Gaelic, signifies 'a plant' or 'a herb.'" "This herb," it is added, "continued to flourish so long as the old church stood, but when it was pulled down it perished. The church thus became celebrated, and numerous devotees went to it in pilgrimage for the performance of religious services." A conflicting local tradition states that Kessog was killed by assassins in the immediate neighbourhood, the place of his martyrdom being Bandry, formerly Banwrith, about a mile and a quarter to the south of the parish church. The spot was marked by a large heap of stones, styled *Carn-ma-Cheasog*, *i.e.* "St. Kessog's cairn." About the middle of last century, when the military road along Loch Lomond was being made, part of this cairn was removed,

[1] Irving's *Dumbartonshire*, p. 157.

and within it was discovered a stone effigy, believed to represent St. Kessog.[1] The remains of the cairn were visible in 1796.[2] Heron, who was in the district in 1792, has a somewhat tantalizing reference to the effigy, if, indeed, it was the same as the one in question. In his *Journey through the West of Scotland*,[3] he says, "A statue of the guardian saint of the place, St. M'Kissock, having been accidentally found in the adjacent churchyard, or somewhere in the neighbourhood, the last proprietor of the estate of Luss was so much pleased with the precious relic that he resolved to station the saint on the summit of the above-mentioned insulated mount (Inch-ta-vannach). In that station it might be supposed that the saint would watch with guardian care over the house of Luss and its environs. The peasants in this neighbourhood, struck with sudden indignation against St. M'Kissock, broke into the repository where he was peaceably awaiting the period of his exaltation, and outrageously decapitated him, and otherwise mutilated his trunk, without bringing him to any form of trial. The violated, mutilated statue thus rendered unfit for the purposes for which the lord of the manor had piously intended it, was then, by his orders, solemnly deposited in the burial-place of the Colquhouns." There is no doubt that the effigy found in Carnmahessog was, at a later date, placed in St. Mary's ruined chapel, close to the mansion-house of Rossdhu, now the burying-place of the Colquhouns. There it remained, at the west wall, till about fifteen years ago, when it was placed, for greater security, in Sir James Colquhoun's private chapel, at the mansion itself. More than a century ago two stone coffins, with lids, were brought to light in the graveyard at the church of Luss. One of them had a rude representation of an hour-glass on one side, and of an open book on the other. It was probably the coffin of an ecclesiastic, but had evidently no connection with St. Kessog.[4]

The rectory of Luss was made a prebend of Glasgow Cathedral in or about the year 1429, by John Cameron, Bishop of Glasgow, with consent

---

[1] Fraser's *Chiefs of Colquhoun*, vol. ii., p. 55.

[2] *Old Statistical Account of Scotland*, vol. xvii., p. 264.

[3] Vol. i., p. 346.

[4] Fraser's *Chiefs of Colquhoun*, vol. ii., p. 56, and *O.S.A.*, vol. xvii., p. 265.

of the patron, John de Collequhone, lord of Luss.[1] The Prebendary of Luss had a manse in the Rottenrow of Glasgow.[2] Unlike St. Machan, of the neighbouring district of Campsie, St. Kessog had no altar in the Cathedral.[3] We have charter evidence to prove that the memory of Kessog was honoured at Luss during the Middle Ages. At Rossdhu is still preserved a charter, of date 1308, by King Robert the Bruce, confirming an earlier one by Malcolm, Earl of Lennox, to Sir John of Luss, granting certain privileges "for the reverence and honour of our patron, the most holy man, the Blessed Kessog" (*ob reverenciam et honorem sanctissimi viri Beati Kessogy patroni nostri*). Similarly, in a charter now at Buchanan Castle, the same King Robert confirmed to God and St. Kessog, in the year 1315, the right of sanctuary for three miles around the church of Luss (*Sciatis nos confirmasse Deo et Beato Kessogo imperpetuum illam libertatem que dicitur Gyrth*, etc.).[4]

When at Luss, some months ago, I failed to get definite information about any spring there named after St. Kessog, though I was told of one near the north lodge of Rossdhu, whose water seemed to be held in special esteem. In Strathblane parish, however, there is a spring dedicated to our saint, described in a charter of 1570 as "ane well callit Sanct Makkessokis well."[5] At Netherton a stone tablet in the wall at the side of the road bears the inscription, "St. Kessog's Well." It was erected some years ago by a lady who lived in Kessogbank, a small villa adjoining the spot. Below the tablet is an iron spout, but the saint is evidently careful to prevent any waste of water, for a key is needed to turn on the supply. The original St. Kessog's well, whence the water is conducted to the spout, is said to be in a wood to the west of Crosshill, some two hundred yards to the north of the road; but an examination of the ground failed to discover its whereabouts. Next to Kessogbank is a recently-

[1] *Origines Parochiales Scotiae*, vol. i., p. 30.

[2] *The Regality Club*, 3rd Series, Part 2, p. 49.

[3] *Transactions of the Glasgow Archaelogical Society* (New Series), vol. i., p. 488.

[4] Fraser's *Chiefs of Colquhoun*, vol. ii., pp. 55, 275, 276.

[5] Guthrie-Smith's *Strathblane*, p. 322.

built Roman Catholic chapel, dedicated to St. Kessog. A chapel to our saint once stood near Gartconnel in East Kilpatrick parish.[1]

The late Mr. J. Guthrie-Smith, in his posthumous work, *Strathendrick and Its Inhabitants*, states (p. 74) that a chapel to St. Kessog stood on the lands of Finnick-Tennent in Drymen parish, probably on "Knockan-heglish," *i.e.* "the hill of the church," where traces of a ruin still exist. In the adjoining glen beside the Carnock is a spring known as the "Holy Well"; and further away a piece of ground was known of old as the "Chappel Croft of St. MacKessog" (p. 220). The same writer reminds us that our saint had a chapel in Kilmaronock parish in the Aberlands, at a place still known as "St. Kessog's," where an ancient yew tree continues to flourish. He supplies the following particulars[2]: "The chaplain of St. Kessog's or MacKessog's Chapel was in existence at the Reformation, though the neighbouring earl had taken possession of his endowments, for in a deed of rentalling by Alexander, Earl of Glencairn, to Patrick M'Kean, as a kindlie tenant of part of the Aberlands, signed at Kilmaronock, 19th October, 1563, the following occurs: 'Wt ane aiker of land pertenand to the Chappell of Sanct Makessok, whereof the maill perteins now instantlie to Sir John Cowper, as chaplaine and possessor of the said Chapellarie during his liftyme.'

"On 12th January, 1580, there is a similar deed by James, Earl of Glencairn, referring to the same lands. By this time the old Roman Catholic chaplain, who had been thus allowed a life-rent of his acre, was no doubt dead, and the chapel in ruins, but the Earl still kept the rent of the small chapel glebe; for we find in this deed that Bartholamew Mackayne had the same lands as his ancestor, but that the Earl reserved the rent of the chapel acre for 'Andro Smyt, our portar.'" It is probable that the stones of the chapel were afterwards used in building houses, for, in a deed of sale of the lands of Aber in 1801, mention is made of the Houses of Saint M'Kesson."

The name of St. Kessog can be traced in Scottish topography. In Senwick parish, now united to Borgue, we find a Kissoktoun in Timothy

[1] Bruce's *History of West Kilpatrick*, p. 295.

[2] *Strathendrick*, pp. 125, 126.

Pont's map of Galloway. The following reference to it occurs in the *Registrum Magni Sigilli* (vol. 1513-46) in a charter dated 22nd July, 1531: "Five marcatas terrarum de Litill Dunrod alias Kessoktoun antiqui extentus in parochia de Sannyk." An estate in Girvan parish is called Balkissock, *i.e.* St. Kessog's town.[1] Among the possessions of the Galbraiths of Gartconnel, "Strochelmakessoc" is mentioned in the chartulary of the Lennox (p. 51). The name is also written "Arochelmakessec." We find a trace of our saint in the Argyllshire parish of Kilmartin, for, as Cosmo Innes tells us, "In 1627 Alexander Campbell was served heir to his father, John, Bishop of Argyll, in the three marks and a half of Lergineddir called Lergi M'Kessaig."[2]

Perthshire has something to tell us concerning our saint. He was titular of the pre-Reformation church of Auchterarder, for we learn from the *Liber Insule Missarum* (p. 4) that "the church of St. Mechesseok of Auchterarder was granted in 1200, with several other churches, by Gilbert, Earl of Strathearn, and his wife, to their newly-founded Abbey of Inchaffray." The following particulars concerning St. Kessog's cultus at Auchterarder are given by the Rev. Dr. James Rankin in *Chronicles of Strathearn* (p. 44): "The old kirk of Makessok lies in a hollow to the north of modern Auchterarder, whose church dates only from 1660. Makessock's Well still exists on the farm of East Kirkton, beside the old glebe and manse which are now part of that farm, having been excambed about 1800." An ill-informed statement in the account of Auchterarder in the *New Statistical Account of Scotland* has given rise to the belief that St. Mungo was patron of the church, or at least had an altar or side-chapel within the building. Mr. A. G. Reid, F.S.A.(Scot.), of Auchterarder, in *Notes and Queries* for January 16th, 1897 (p. 45), remarks: "There is neither a side chapel on the outside of the building nor room within its narrow walls for a side altar, and there is no historical evidence to support such a theory." The old church, though roofless, is in fairly good preservation. A local tradition asserts that the roof fell in one Sunday after the congregation had dis-

[1] *New Statistical Account of Scotland* (Ayrshire), p. 396.

[2] *Orig. Par. Scot.*, vol. ii., p. 95.

persed. A slab, marked with a Latin cross, was brought to light some years ago, and is now preserved within the ruin. The ancient font stood at the western entrance, but was removed not long ago to the parish church in the town, whither the bell was also taken. A fair in honour of St. Kessog was for long held on his festival (O.S.). *Vide* Mr. Reid's article in *Chronicles of Strathearn*, p. 363. I am indebted to Mr. Reid for the following particulars regarding St. Mackessog's Well, referred to above: "On the publication of the *Liber Insule Missarum* in 1847, by the Bannatyne Club, it was seen that the traditionary name of the well, till then unaccounted for, corresponded with the name of the Patron Saint of the adjoining church. The antique appearance of the well, with some rough masonry around it, was unfortunately destroyed within the last few years, its water being taken away in pipes for a supply to an adjoining farm." In our own day an Episcopal church at Auchterarder is called after St. Kessog.

Callander, too, had our saint as its patron. A market was held there annually in the month of March, called "Feil-ma-Chessaig," *i.e.* "St. Kessog's festival."[1] The site of the old church of Callander was the circular mound still known as "Tom-ma-Chessaig," sometimes "Tom-na-Chessaig," *i.e.* "St. Kessog's mound," where, according to tradition, butts were formerly placed for the practice of archery.[2] As we learn from the Rev. Dr. Rankin, there is also a "Tom-na-chessaig" in Comrie, where "the old name has a modern recognition in a local Free Masons' Lodge of St. Kessack." The fact that one of the Comrie fairs, viz. that on the third Wednesday of March, was called St. Kessack's indicates that the ancient church of the parish was in all likelihood dedicated to him.[3] Bishop Forbes, in *Kalendars of Scottish Saints*, mentions a St. Kessog's Fair, held in March in the island of Cumbrae, but he gives a mistaken reference to the *New Statistical Account of Scotland*. There is no allusion to any such fair in the article on Cumbrae in that work itself. If we look further north we find Kessock

[1] *New Statistical Account* (Perthshire), p. 356.

[2] *Old Statistical Account*, vol. xi., p. 609, and *New Statistical Account* (Perthshire), p. 355.

[3] *Chronicles of Strathearn*, p. 37, and *New Statistical Account* (Perthshire), p. 594.

Ferry in Ross-shire, opposite the town of Inverness. In 1649 the name was variously written "Keassack" and "Keassock."[1] In the same neighbourhood are the lands of Easter and Wester Kessog. The three are thus mentioned together in a charter of 1565: "Terras de Eistir Kessokkis cum lie ferry de Kessokkis, Terras de Westir Kessokkis cum lie Stell et brasina de Kessokkis."[2] Close to Craig Phadrick, and beside the village of Clachnaharry, is a spring called Priseag Well, said to have been blessed by St. Kessog. To this circumstance it probably owes its reputation for curing sore eyes, and for counteracting the power of the evil eye.[3]

A striking proof of the persistence of St. Kessog's cultus in Scotland is to be found in the respect so long shown to his bell, or rather bells, for there were two. Thus in a charter, of date eighth of January, 1538-39, relating to the lordship of Drummond, in Perthshire, the following occurs: "terras de Struthill, Barnakillis, cum capella et sacra campana Sancti Kessogi."[4] Again in a charter of date 25th October, 1542, the king confirmed to David, lord of Drummond, certain lands, comprising as before, "Struhill, Barnaclis, cum capella et sacra campana S. Kassogy."[5] A similar reference to St. Kessog's chapel and bell occurs in a later charter, of date third of September, 1582.[6] Two retours, dated respectively 1662 and 1675, show that St. Kessog's chapel and bell were still respected in the latter half of the seventeenth century. The second gives two spellings of the saint's name, "Cum capella et sacra campana Sancti Cessogii (vel Kessogii)."[7] St. Kessog's other bell seems to have been kept somewhere in the lands of Buchanan beside Loch Lomond. It is alluded to in a charter of date January twentieth, 1566-67, wherein the King and Queen confirmed to George Buchanan of that ilk the lands of Buchanan, etc.,

---

[1] *Inverness and Dingwall Presbytery Records*, pp. 157, 158, 160.

[2] *Reg. Mag. Sig.*, vol. 1546-80, p. 381.

[3] Fraser's *Northern Folk-Lore on Wells and Water*, p. 13.

[4] *Reg. Mag. Sig.*, vol. 1513-46, p. 422. [5] *Reg. Mag. Sig.*, vol. 1513-46, p. 656.

[6] *Reg. Mag. Sig.*, vol. 1580-93, p. 136.

[7] *Inquis. Retorn. Ab.* (Perth), Nos. 708 and 880.

with the fishings in Loch Lomond, along with the bell and alms of St. Kessog (*Cum campana et elimosina S. Cassogi*).[1]

Even in the nineteenth century we find a trace of our saint's cultus in certain surviving surnames, not so common as some others, but still tolerably well known. I refer to such names as Kessack, Kessan, Kesson, M'Isaac, Mackissack, and Mackissock. These carry our thoughts back to the sixth century, and fix them on one who has left behind him not a few tokens of his presence and power.

---

[1] *Reg. Mag. Sig.*, vol. 1546-80, p. 436.

No. XI.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON HISTORIES OF INVENTIONS AND BOOKS OF SECRETS.

(*THIRD SUPPLEMENT.*)

BY

JOHN FERGUSON, LL.D., F.S.A.Lond. and Scot.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF CHEMISTRY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

(*Read at a Meeting of the Society, held on 15th March, 1894.*)

1. The present supplement, though numbered separately for reference, really consists of the third part of the paper submitted to the Society on the above-mentioned date. It embraces treatises in a variety of languages, on a variety of topics: receipts useful in different arts and sciences; secrets of the toilet; cures for ailments; wonders and prodigies of nature. It differs, therefore, from the previous supplements, the first of which was restricted mainly to Italian books, and the second to books on medicine.

During the time that has elapsed since the paper was written, it has been revised and entries made of a few newly discovered works and editions. The English books, however, which were originally included, have been removed, and reserved for separate treatment. The number of them has become so large, that I have thought it desirable to consider them by themselves, in order that the character and extent of this literature, published in this country, more particularly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, might be judged of, apart from analogous foreign works. Moreover, so few of the English books mentioned happen to be

translations, that the disjunction of these from the originals will not, I trust, cause inconvenience. Any reader, however, who may wish to have a view of the consecutive editions and translations of any single treatise, and who might be hampered by this disjunction, will have his wants supplied, as far as possible, by cross references from one set of books to the other.

I cannot refrain from saying once more that the amount of early technical literature, whether in respect of distinct works or of different editions, far surpasses what I believed to exist. Whether it was instructive or not, there was plenty of it current, and if our predecessors were ignorant it was not for want of books. The authors, however, seem to have been as ill-informed as their readers; how then could they impart instruction, no matter how many books they wrote and sold?

2. The work with which the present section opens might have appeared more appropriately in the second Supplement amongst medical writings. As its name denotes it contains prescriptions for every disease, the preparation of ointments and pills, the virtues of a number of plants, and, incidentally, certain cosmetic receipts. It may perhaps be regarded as too purely medical for the present list, but it may very well receive notice as a contemporary counterpart to the works of Valescus and Varignana on one hand and of the later *Treasure of Evonymus* on the other. How far it is the work of Galen himself I am not prepared to say, but if it be his in part there does not seem to be any corresponding separate treatise by him. It purports also to be translated from the Latin, but if that be so I have not seen any mention of a copy of the original. In the British Museum Catalogue, the present work is put in a place by itself, neither amongst the genuine nor the supposititious works of the author. While, of course, it may be authentic, it is possible that its name denotes no more than that it is a collection of the prescriptions which, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, passed under Galen's name, and were opposed to the chemical or spagirical remedies which were just beginning to show themselves. One thing is quite certain, that the medico-astrological introduction is modern, as well as various medicaments—not to speak of diseases—which were unknown to the ancients.

3. The two copies which I have got are interesting by the wide interval between their dates and by the consequent differences between them so far as externals go.

Recettario di Galeno Opti- | mo e probato a tutte le infirmita che sotto | dono a Huomini et a delle di dentro et di | fuori li corpi. Et cõ rimedio de cõseruar la | sanita et prolõgar la vita: et con molte altre | cose nouo che in li altri prima stampati non | erano: et con molte altre recette cõtra la pe | ste. Tradutto in volgare per maestro Zua- | ne saracino Medico Eccellentissimo ad | instantia de lo imperatore.

Small 8vo. A to H in eights; or ff. 63 [1]. Black letter. Double columns.

Collation: A1 *recto*, Title page. The lower half is occupied by a woodcut representing a patient on a chair having something done to his right knee. Behind is the physician apparently occupied in dismembering birds, and there is an attendant with a basen. *Verso*, Tabula, ends A5 *verso*.

A6 *recto*, Text begins.

B2 *verso*, is a woodcut of the human body as under the signs of the Zodiac.

B4 *recto*, Woodcut of the Tabula Salamone.

H7 *recto*, the text ends. After the text is the Registro, and the Colophon:

¶ Stampato in Vinegia per Francesco di Alef | sandro Bindoni: & Mapheo Pasini: com | pagni: nel Anno. 1528. del me- | se di Febraro.

H7 *verso*, blank.

H8 *recto*, blank. *Verso*, printer's device of Tobit and the Angel. This device came first under my observation in editions of the *Physionomia* of Michael Scotus, printed in 1533 and 1537 by the same printers, and it will recur once or twice in the present review. The difference between this and those other books is that this is in black letter in double columns, while they are in italics in long lines. The result is that the former looks antique, the latter modern, with an interval, in one instance at least, of only five years between the two.

4. The other later edition is as follows:

Recettario di Galeno. Approvato, Et Molto Vtile alle infirmità, à che sono sottoposti gli corpi humani. Con rimedij di conseruare la sanità, e prolongar la vita con altre noue ricette, che non erano negli altri prima ristampate, & lire da preseruarsi contra il mal contagioso. Tradotto in lingua volgare, per lo Eccell. Maestro Giouanni Saracino Medico, ad istanza della Cesarea Catholica, e Real Maestà dell' Imperatore.

In Venetia, M.DC.LXXXIII.

Apresso Sebastian Menegatti. Con Licenza de' Superiori.

18mo. A to G in twelves; or, pp. 154 [14]. On p. 14 is a woodcut of the veins.

This is a poorly got up little volume, intended apparently for everyday

use. Neither of the preceding is in the British Museum. The copies which are there are dated respectively Venice [1508], 1518, 1545, 1640, 1645. The book, therefore, must have met some sort of want, else it could hardly have reached the ripe age of a hundred and eighty years.

5. In bibliography it is sometimes almost startling how books related to one another, and of unquestionable rarity, come together from quite different quarters. It is not so long ago since I got a copy of the 1520 edition of the *Secreta Secretorum*, and the description of it was hardly published when a copy of the no less rare German translation made its appearance.

Das aller edlest und bewer | test Regiment der gesundtheyt, Auch von allen ver- | borgen künsten vñ Künigklichen Regimenten Aristotelis. Das er dem Grossmech | tigen Künig Alexandro zůgeschriben hatt. Auss Arabischer sprach durch Meister | Philipsen, dem Bischoff Vonn Valentia, der Stat Jerapolis, In das latein | verwandlet, Nachmals auss dem latein in das Teijtsch gebracht, Bey | Doctor Johañ Lorchner zů Spalt (So beyder Keyser Frydrichs | vñ Maximilians Löblicher gedechtnuss Rath vñ Mathe- | maticus gewesen) nach seinem tod geschribē gefunden | zů auffenthaltung vñ fristung yn gesundtheit | menschlichem lebenn zů gůtt; Durch Jo- | hann Besolt in Truck verordnet. | [Vignette]. M.D.XXXI.

Small 4to. A to N in fours; or ff. [4] XLVIII.

The Vignette represents Aristotle presenting his book to Alexander.

Aj contains the title; *verso*, Vorrede; Aij *recto* to Aiij *recto*, the Contents; Aiij *recto*, Aristotle's preface, ends Aiiij *recto*. Aiiij *verso* is taken up with a woodcut of Alexander in the dress of a royal warrior of the year 1531. B to Niiij *recto* contains the text. At the end is the colophon:

Gedruckt zů Augspurg durch Heynrich Stayner, Am. 1. | tag Martij, des M.D.XXXI. Jars |

The *verso* is blank.

So far as it goes this is a translation of the first part of the 1520 edition, embracing the *Secreta Secretorum* and omitting the tracts *Signa temporum*, *de Intellectu*, *de Universalibus* and others formerly enumerated.* But there are several omissions; for instance, a part of the chapter on Stones (German Translation, chap. lix.) and sections both at the beginning and the end of the book. It has not however been disembowelled like the English translation of 1702.†

* Supplement II., *Transactions*, III., 1897, p. 180. † Part IV., p. 326.

The copy of this translation in the British Museum (520, a. 12) was published by Stayner in 1530, in 4to. It seems to be different, for the collation given in the Catalogue is ff. 46, whereas my copy has ff. 48. There is a translation also in French, but I have not seen either of these editions.

6. Do as one will it seems impossible to escape from Albertus Magnus and his two books of Secrets. In the previous Supplement I thought I was done with him for the time being, but, since its issue, another has put itself in evidence. The two treatises are in one volume, printed uniformly; but as they have distinct title pages and separate signatures and pagination, they are virtually independent, and I do not doubt may sometimes be met with detached from each other.

Alberti | Magni | Specvlvm | Astronomiae: | Nvnc Primvm E | m.ſ. Codice in lucem edi- | tum. | Praemittvntvr Avtem | eiuſdem Authoris libelli, | De Virtvtibvs Herba- | rum, Lapidum, & animalium quorun- | dam, Item de mirabilibus mundi, & de | quibuſdam effectibus cauſatis à | quibuſdam animali- | bus, &c. |
Lvgdvni | Anno MDC.XV.

24mo. Signatures A to G in twelves; or pp. 168 (misprinted 166).

The *Liber Aggregationis*, which treats of plants, stones, and animals, with the *de mirabilibus mundi*, occupies to p. 115. The *Speculum Astronomiae* fills up the rest. This tract is a novel addition, and I have not met it before along with the *Liber Aggregationis*.

7. The other treatise has the following title:

Alberti | Magni | De Secretis | Mvliervm Libel- | lvs, Scholiis | auctus, & à mendis re- | purgatus. | Cum Indice locupletiſſimo. |
Lvgdvni | Anno M.DC.XV. |

24mo. Signatures A to G in twelves. G 11 and 12 are blank; or pp. 164 (misprinted 166), [4 blank].

There is nothing noticeable about this edition. There is a copy in the British Museum, 1175 a. 2 (2).

8. [May, 1898. In 1884 (Part III., p. 213, Reprint, p. 28) I referred to a book entitled *Ein Newer Albertus Magnus*, printed at Frankfurt, by Weygandt Han, without date. In a note the similarity between a section of it with its illustrations and the work of Thomas Raynalde, *The Birth of Mankinde*, was pointed out.

I have just got another edition of this work, printed by Han, but dated 1556. I have some difficulty in deciding which of the two is the earlier. Although similar in all respects they are not identical. The title page in black and red, the woodcut border containing in compartments the most prominent physicians of antiquity, the ornamental capitals, the woodcuts, the type, and the same number of leaves, are contained in both; but details of typography, the arrangement of the title page, the position of the signatures, the use of capitals, and so on, show that the books were printed at different times.

In the note referred to it is implied, erroneously, that the edition of 1540 of Raynalde's book is in the Hunterian Museum. The editions there are of 1545, 1565 and 1598. I have myself acquired copies of the two earlier editions. That of 1545 is in 8vo, printed in bold black letter. The signatures are: A in four, B to I, Hh, in eights, Hhh in six, K to Q in eights, R in four, S to X in eights, Y in ten. There are four leaves of engravings in this copy, but, two, if not four, are wanting. There is no copy of this edition in the British Museum.

The 1565 edition is a large 8vo, or small 4to, printed with two sizes of black letter. The signatures are: A in four, B to S in eights, T in six, and there are four leaves of woodcuts, which form a complete set. The copy I have belonged to Herbert, and is described by him in the *Typographical Antiquities*, London, 1785, I., p. 581.

This edition is in the British Museum.

The edition of London, 1598, is much inferior to both the preceding. It, too, is in black letter, but it is a poor fount, and the paper is soft and weak. It is in small 4to, A in four, B to O in eight, or pp. [8] 204. The woodcuts—poorly executed—are included in the signatures and pagination as well. There is a copy in the Hunterian Library, and in the British Museum. Other editions followed in the seventeenth century.]

9. A collection of receipts in French, professing to be translated from the Italian, has come into my possession. As it was obviously a chap-book of some time last century, I was sceptical about its being a translation, and thought that this statement might be a ruse to procure for the book a currency which it might not have enjoyed if it had been

announced as of French origin. I investigated the matter, and have been rewarded by the discovery in the British Museum of a cluster of receipt books, which have not hitherto been included in my lists. The collection was really first written in Italian, and the book enjoyed an intermittent circulation for upwards of two hundred years, as the following enumeration shows. It is more than probable, however, that there are editions besides those to which I shall refer.*

The list begins with the Italian of 1529, which is probably the very first of the set. The description is from the British Museum copy (7953, f. 32).

Opera Nvova | Intitolata Dificio De | Ricette nella quale ſi contengono tre | utiliſsimi Ricettari, | Nel primo ſi tratta di molte & diuerſe uirtu. | Nel ſecondo ſe inſegna a comporre uarie ſorti | de ſoaui & utili odori, | Nel terzo & ultimo ſi tratta di alcuni rimedi | ſecreti medicinali neceſsari in riſanar li | corpi humani, come nella tauola | qui ſequente ſi puo uedere. | M D X X I X

Small 4to, A, *b* to *f* in fours; or ff. [4] 20, but the numbers are irregular. Printed in italics. At the end of the text:

Stampato in Venetia per Giouanantonio et | fratelli da Sabbio. MDXXIX.

Ai, Title, surrounded by a broad border of white loops and twists upon a black ground.

Verso, Full page picture of a master in a chair, dictating to a clerk or scholar. There are books, a sphere, a compass, etc., and the picture is surrounded by a border of white knots on a black ground—different from the other.

Aii *recto*, Incomincia La Tavola. Ends Aiv *recto*.

Aiv *verso*, Picture of a monk in a laboratory, directing a servant who is pounding something in a mortar; boxes, an hour glass, etc., are on a shelf.

bi, Allo mio benigno lettore, and then the first receipt: Remedio contra ogni puzor et fetor di boca. This first part ends e i *verso*, or ff. 1-17, (*sic* for 13).

diii *verso*, At the top is a note to the reader within a white and black border.

eii, The second part begins with a title page enclosed in a white and black border like that round the *verso* of the first title. It ends e iii, fo. 19 (*sic* for 15).

eiv, The third part begins with a border like that round the first title. On the *verso*, top half, is a woodcut of a distilling apparatus. This ends fiv *recto*, or fo. 20. *verso* is blank. The borders and woodcuts give this book a very odd appearance.†

---

* May, 1896. Shortly after the above was written, and after the other editions had been described, I got a copy of the Italian of 1538, which proved that my surmise had been correct.

† The only copy I have seen for sale was in the catalogue of a Florence bookseller, but I failed to get it.

10. I may now enumerate the other editions in Italian and in French which are in the British Museum, and the two which are in my possession.

Opera Nvova Inti- | tolata Dificio Di | Recette Nellaqvale Si | contengono tre utiliſsimi Recettarij. | Nel Primo ſe tratta di molte & diuerſe uirtu. | Nel Secondo ſe inſegna à comporre uarie | ſorti de ſoaui et utili odori. | Nel Terzo et ultimo, ſi tratta di alcuni rime- | di ſecreti medicinali neceſſari in riſanar | li corpi humani, come nella | tauola ſe contiene. | [Device.] In Venetia. |

Small 8vo. A to D in eights, or ff. 30 [2]. Printed in italics, but the index in Gothic letter. The device is a draped female figure marked Fede, holding a cross with her left arm and a cup on her right palm. A hilly landscape, with a town in the background. Round two sides of the picture are the words: Senza di me l'hvom | fassi a Dio ribello. |

A1, Title. *Verso*: to the reader.

A2 *recto*, Text begins and ends D6 *recto*, ff. 2-30.

D6 *verso*, La Tavola, ends D8 *verso*. Then the colophon:

Stampato in Vineggia per Mathio Pagan | in frezaria, al ſegno della Fede. |

No date. f. 24, woodcut of a Still. [B. M. 1038, d. 4.]

11. In another edition of the *Deficio* it is surprising that the title should have been radically altered by the omission of the very phrase by which the book was to be identified: *Intitolata Deficio di Recetti.* This copy came into my hands quite unexpectedly after the rest of the list was finished. It is not in the Museum.

Opera Nvova | Nella Qvale Si Con | tengono tre utiliſſimi Ricettari. | Nel primo si tratta di molte | et diuerſe uirtu. | Nel ſecondo ſe inſegna à comporre | uarie ſorti de ſuaui, et | utili odori. | Nel terzo et ultimo ſi tratta d'alcuni ri- | medi ſecreti medicinali neceſſari in | riſanar gli corpi humani. | Come nella Tauola | qui ſeguente ſi | pouedere. | MDXXXVIII.

Small 8vo. A to H in fours, or ff. 32. Printed in italics. The title is enclosed in a woodcut border of scrolls, faces, and grotesque figures—a copy of that round Michael Scotus' *Physonomia*, 1533, 1537.

Woodcut of a distilling apparatus on f. 21 *verso*.

Collation. Ai Title. Aii *recto*, the text begins with a note to the reader, and ends Giiii *verso*. Then follows immediately the Table of Contents, ending Hiiii *verso*. The register comes next, and lastly the colophon:

In Vinegia per Guilielmo da Fontareto.

M D X X X V I I I.

12. B. M. 1168, e. 8 (2).

Opera Nvova | Intitolata Dificio Di Recette. Nellaqvale Si | contengono tre vtiliſſimi Recettarij. | Nel Primo ſe tratta di molte & diuerſe virtu. | Nel Secondo ſe inſegna à comporre varie | ſorti de ſoaui & vtili odori. | Nel Terzo &

vltimo ſi tratta di alcuni | rimedi ſecreti medicinali neceſſari in | riſanar li corpi humani, come | nella tauola ſe contiene. [Device of Tobit and the Angel] M. D. L.

Small 8vo. A to D in eights; or ff. 30 (misprinted 29) [2]. Printed in Italics; the Index in Roman.

A1, Title. *Verso*: address to the reader.

A2 *recto*, Text begins, and ends D6 *recto*, ff. 2-30.

D6 *verso*, Incomincia la Tavola, ends D8 *verso*. Then the colophon:

Stampata in Vinegia per Franceſco Bindoni, & Ma- | pheo Paſini compagni. Nel anno del | Signore. M. D. L. | Del Meſe di Mazo. |

P. 24 is the woodcut of the Still.

Simply a reprint of the edition of 1529. It resembles Pasini's editions of Michael Scotus.

13. I now come to the copies of the French translation in the British Museum which I have examined. The earliest (1038, a. 1) is of date 1541, but it is obviously not the first:

Traicte | nouueau, Intitule | Baſtiment de receptes: Nou- | uellement traduict de Italien | en langue Francoyſe. | Contenant trois pe- | tites parties de re- | ceptaires. | Le contenu deſquelles vous voy | rez en la page ſuyuante. | Oultre la precedente impref- | ſion ont eſte adiouſtez aulcuns | ſecretz pour les maladies | des femmes, tant en tra- | uail denfant que aul- | trement.

Small narrow 12mo. A to L in sixes. No foliation. Small Gothic character. There is an ornamental device at the bottom of the title.

Ai, Title. *Verso*: contents of the three parts.

Aii *recto*, Dizain.

Aii *verso*, Au Lecteur, ends Aiii *recto*.

Aiii *verso*, Text begins, and ends Lv *recto*.

Lv *recto*, Colophon:

☞ Imprime en An- | uers par Matthieu | Crom. Lan. M. D. | xlj.

Lv *verso* and Lvj are blank.

The text of the Italian book comes down to Li *recto*. The extra medical receipts are contained Li *verso* to Lv *recto*.

This is a very curious little book. It is of the size and shape of the 1534 edition of Rabelais.

14. The next, in the Museum, is marked 1169, a. 3:

Bastiment | de Receptes, contenant trois | parties de receptuaires. | ¶ La premiere, traicte de diuerſes ver | tuz & proprietez des choſes. | ¶ La ſecõde, eſt de diuerſes ſortes d'o | deurs, & compoſitions d'icelles. | ¶ La tierce comprent aucuns ſecretz | medicinaulx, propres a con- | ſeruer la ſanté. | ¶ Auecq certains Remedes | contre la peſte. | Item | Le plaiſant Iardin | des Receptes. | ¶ En Anuers ches Iehan Richart | au Soleil dor. | 1555. |

Square 16mo. A to P (?) in eights; imperfect. No pagination. No Index.

Ai *recto*, Title.

Ai *verso*, Text begins, and goes to Pvij *verso*; all thereafter is wanting.

The Italian book ends Hi *recto*. On the same the extra receipts begin and end Hiiij *verso*.

Hv *recto* to Li *verso*, Aultres ſecretz adioutez oultre les precedentes impreſſions.

These are chiefly for beautifying the person, and at the end several pages are devoted to remedies for the plague.

Lij *recto*:

Le plaiſant iardin | des receptes, ou ſont plantez diuers | arbriſſeaulx & odorantes fleurs du | creu de Philoſophie naturelle, | cultiue par Medecins treſ- | expertz en phiſique ſpe | culation, contenant | deux parties: | ¶ La premiere traictera des reme- | des pour maladies ſuruenan- | tes au corps humain. | ¶ La ſeconde de pluſieurs ioyeu- | ſetez a faire en toute hon- | neſte compaignie. | Item pluſieurs receptes pour faire | pouldre a Canon. | Item la medecine de Maiſtre Grima- | che, contre pluſieurs maladies. | Item pluſieurs nouueautez compo- | ſez par Symon de Millan. | Traduict de langue Italique en | Francoys par Maiſtre Quil | lery de paſſebreue. |

Maiſtre Grimache's receipts are partly in verse, and they are for the cure of social and domestic troubles rather than for bodily ailments. They are not reprinted in the later editions.

15. A gap of a hundred and forty-four years ensues before the next edition with which I am acquainted appeared. One can hardly suppose that the book fell entirely into oblivion for that period, and was then revived; but if editions of it were published in the interval, no copy has come under my notice, whereas there are enough later ones to show that the book retained something of its old popularity. The first I have to mention is in the British Museum (1038, e. 37).

Le | Bastimens | Des | Receptes, | Traduit D'Italien | en François. | Augmenté d'une infinité de beaux ſe- | crets depuis peu mis en uſage. | Avec un autre petit traité des Receptes | intitulé le grand Jardin. |

A Troyes, | Chez Jacques Oudot, Im- | primeur ruë du Temple. 1699. |

Small 12mo. (A) to M in eights and fours alternately. No pagination. Very roughly printed on poor paper; a chap-book.

Signature A is omitted.

(A)i is the title.

(A)ij. The text begins and ends M4. There is no index or contents.

The Italian book goes down to Iij *recto*, the extra receipts from Iij *verso* to Iv *recto*.

"Le plaisant Jardin," with a sort of contents title, like 1555, from Iv *verso* to M4 *verso*.

This edition stops at "Pour faire quelque oyſeaux sembleront être mort, lesquels pourtant ne le seront pas."

The 1555 edition contains a good deal more.

The fly-title, prefixed to the *Jardin*, is as follows:

Autre | Petit Traité | Des Receptes intitulé le | plaiſant Jardin, cultivé | par Medicins trés experts | en Phiſique. | La premiere partie traitera des | remede (*sic*) pour les maladies qui | ſurviennent au corps humain. | La ſeconde pluſieurs joyeu- | ſetez à [*] en toute honnête | compagnie. | Item pluſieurs Receptes pour | faire poudre à Canon. | Traduit en (*sic*) Italien en Fran- | çois; par Maître Quillery | de Paſſebreuve. |

16. The second copy is in the Museum (1038, a. 2 (2)).

Le | Bastiment | Des Receptes, | Tradvit D'Italien | en François. | Augmenté d'vne infinité de beaux ſecrets, | depuis peu mis en vſage. | Auec vn autre petit traicté de Receptes, | intitulé le grand Jardin. | [Device.]

Imprimé a Troyes, & ſe vend | A Paris, | Chez Antoine De Raffle, | Imprimeur & Marchand Libraire, | Ruë de petit Pont, à l'Image | Sainct Antoine. |

Small 12mo. A to M in eights and fours; no pagination. Chap-book. No date, but Sæc. XVII.

Ai, Title. *Verso*: to the reader.

Aij *recto*, Text begins and ends M 4 *verso*. No Index.

The Italian book ends Hij *recto*. The extra receipts Hij *verso* to Hiv *verso*. "Le Plaisant Jardin" Ii *recto* to Miv *verso*.

17. The third copy is also in the Museum (1038, a. 2 (1)).

Le | Bastiment | Des Receptes. | Traduit d'Italien en | François. | Auec vn petit traicté de Receptes inti- | tulé le plaiſant Iardin. |

A Troyes. | Chez Denis Clement: | demeurant en la ruë du Temple. |

Small 12mo. A to M in eights and fours. No pagination. Chap-book poorly printed. No date, but Sæc. XVII. No Index.

Ai, Title.

Aij *recto*, Text, which ends Miij *recto*.

Miij *verso*, Av Lectevr.

Miv. A woodcut on both sides of men on a hunting expedition with bows and dogs—to represent the month of March.

On Cv *recto* is a picture of ladies riding, entitled: Mayvs.

On Gvj *recto* is another entitled November.

The Italian book ends Gvj *recto*. The extra receipts begin Gvj *verso* and end Hi *verso*. "Le Plaisant Jardin" begins Hij *recto* and ends Miij *recto*.

18. The latest is that in my own collection.

Le | Batiment | Des | Receptes, | Traduit D'Italien | en François. | Et augmenté d'une

---

* *Faire* is wanting in this copy. Compare 1555.

infinité de beaux | Secrets depuis peu mis en uſage. | Avec un autre petit Traité de Recepte | intitulé le grand Jardin,|

A Troyes, | Chez Jean Antoine Garnier, | Imprimeur-Libraire, rue du Temple. | Avec permiſſion.

12mo. A to M in alternate eights and fours; or, pp. 140 [1, 3 blank]. The book is not dated, but the license is dated Paris, October 22, 1738.

The book is rudely printed on rough paper. It is not in the British Museum.

19. It was the acquisition of this copy which led me to the discovery of the Italian original of 1529, and of the other editions now enumerated. There could hardly be a greater contrast in appearance than what exists between the first edition, with its unusual ornamentation and handsome exterior, and these last chap-books, printed in very common style on miserable paper, without a vestige of a thought about their outer form.

It is difficult to say what kept it alive for over two hundred years, from 1529 to 1740. As it stands, it is a miscellaneous gathering, not arranged on any principle, and there is not even a list of contents! It was not, therefore, meant to be consulted in an emergency. It contains medical receipts, practical receipts, receipts for the toilet, perfumery, dyeing, cooking, preserving, legerdemain tricks, and so on, but it is impossible to find what one wants without hunting through the whole book. Withal the book is interesting in respect of its age and persistence.

20. In connection with personal decoration, and as anticipating the very rare work of Jean Liebaut* I happened to allude to the book of André Le Fournier, so long ago as 1883.† When I quoted it I knew that it was most uncommon, and I never anticipated having a copy for exhibition. This, however, is one of the shy books that come occasionally out of their retreats, and the obtaining of it has caused me to look rather carefully into its history, especially as Brunet on the subject is not more satisfactory than usual. The edition of 1530 was what I mentioned in 1883.

---

* Part I., p. 194. (Reprint 1883, p. 15, note; 1896, p. 18.)

† Part II., p. 258. (Reprint 1883, p. 48; 1896, p. 34.)

It seems to be the first, and is in the British Museum (1174, d. 2). It is as follows:

¶ La decoration | Dhumaine nature, et aornement des | Dames, Compile et extraict des tres excellēs docteurs, et plus ex | pers medecins, tant anciens | que modernes par Maiſtre | Andre le fournier docteur | regent en la faculte de | medicine en luniuer | ſite de Paris Nou | uellement impri | me et non veu | par cy de | uant. | Auec Priuilege |

¶ On les vend a Paris par Jehan | ſainct Denys & Jehan Longis, au | palays a la gallerie, par ou on va a | la Chancellerie. | Md.xxx.

Small 8vo. Signatures: a in eight; aa, four. A to G, all in eight. a and aa are not numbered, but A to G are numbered: Fo. i to Fu (*sic*) lvi, which is correct. The title is printed in red and black. Black letter with a few ornamented capital letters.

Collation:

ai *recto*, Title. *Verso*: License to print, granted to Pierre le ver, dated Septr. siziesme, 1530, which ends aii *recto* (misprinted aiii).

aii *verso*, Woodcut. A man in robes, with ermine tippet and round cap, holding a hand mirror (?) in his left hand and pointing with the forefinger of his right. Behind his head is a star, over his head five stars, in front two stars; in the background a river, and spires and other buildings; in front a tree and a flowering plant, close beside him what looks like a small lion.

aiii *recto*, Andreas le Fournier's Dedication to Johannes Morin, in Latin, ends aiiii *verso*. At the end is a facsimile of Le Fournier's signature.

av *recto*, Le prologue, ends avii *recto*.

avii *verso*, Woodcut of a man in gown and cap on a chair, with a book lying open on a desk before him. This woodcut is enclosed in a border of four quite different pieces and over it in large letters:

Cy finiſt ce Pre | ſent Prologue |

aviii *recto*, The Table, which ends aaiiii *verso*.

Ai *recto*, The text begins, and ends Gviii *recto*, ff. i to lvi *recto*. The *verso* is blank.

Gviii *recto*, After the text is the colophon, in black:

¶ Cy finiſt ce preſent liure de la decora- | tion dhumaine nature. Nouuellemēt im | prime a Paris, par Pirrre (*sic*) lever Et fut | acheue le. xviii. du moys doctobre. Mille | cinq cens trente. | *

In the later editions Le Fournier's dedication and the license to print are omitted. The first edition has wider margins, and is in a handsomer form than the others.

---

* Brunet spells the word "presant." He condenses the colophon, omits the misprint, and writes *Leber* for *lever*. *Manuel*, 1862; III., col. 932.

In it the subject is divided into the following heads:

La decoration et ornement des dames.
Des pouldres odoriferantes et eaue muscat.
Des Huilles odoriferes.
Leaue de Tartre.
Oingnemens bons pour la personne.
Pour faire ypocras.
Pour la grauelle.
Pour faire bon basme.

To this in the 1531 edition a few receipts are added.

21. The 1531 edition is also in the British Museum (1174, d. 1).

La decoratiõ | Dhumaine nature, et aornement | des Dames, Cõpile et extraict des | tres excellẽs docteurs, et plꝰ expers | medicins, tãt anciens q̃ modernes | par Maiſtre Andre le Fournier do- | cteur regẽt en la faculte de medeci- | ne en luniuerſite de Paris. |

¶ Item par hõneſte maniere, mon- | ſtre a toutes gẽs pluſieurs belles et | ſouueraines Receptes tãt en lart de | medicine que pour faire ſauõs poul | dres et pommes redolentes en ſen- | teurs Auſſi pluſieurs eaues deli- | cieuſes & amoureuſes a lauer & net- | toyer tãt les corps que les habille- | mẽs, lesquelles preſeruent de toute | corruptiõ. Imprime Nouuellemẽt | par Claude Veycellier. |

¶ On les vend a Lyõ en rue mercie | re a lenſeigne ſainct Jehã baptiſte. |

Small square 8vo. Signatures: A to G in eights, ff. [i] ii—l numbered, vi not numbered. The title is in red and black, enclosed in a border of four pieces. Black letter, with a few ornamented capitals.

Collation:

Ai *recto*, Title.

Ai *verso*, The Prologue, which ends Aiii *recto*, or f. [i] *verso*, to f. iii *recto*.

Aiii *verso*, The text begins, and ends Gii *recto*, or f. iii *verso* to f. l *recto*.

Gii *verso*, The table, which ends Gvi *verso*.

Gvii *recto*, Senſuyuent aulcunes receptes | de nouueau adiouxtes |, ends Gviii *recto*. *Verso* blank.

On Gii *recto*, or f. l *recto* after the text is the colophon:

¶ Cy finiſt ce preſent liure intitu- | le la decoratiõ dhumaine nature. | Nouuellement imprime a Lyon, | par Claude veycellier libraire et | imprimeur demourant en rue mer | ciere a lenſeigne ſainct Jehan ba- | ptiſte. Et fut acheve le ꝑmier iour | de Mars mil cinq cẽs trẽte & vng. |

The difference between this and the 1530 edition is a couple of pages of additional receipts.

22. The next edition is that of which I can show a copy.

La decoratiõ | Dhumaine nature, & aornemẽt | des dames, Cõpile & extraict des | treſexcellẽs docteurs et plus ex- | pers medecins, tant anciens que | modernes

par Maiſtre Andre le | Fournier docteur regent en la fa | culte de Medecine en Luniuer- | ſite de Paris. |

¶ Itē par honeſte maniere, mon | ſtre a toutes gēs pluſieurs belles | et ſouueraines Receptes tant en | lart de medecine q̄ pour faire ſa- | uons pouldres et pōmes redolen- | tes en ſenteurs. Auſſi pluſieurs | eaues delicieuſes et amoureuſes | a lauer & nettoyer tāt les corps q̄ | les abillemēs, leſquelles preſer- | uent de toute corruption. |

¶ On les vend a Lyō en rue mer | ciere a lenſeigne. S. Jehā bapti. |

Small square 8vo. Signatures: A to G in eights, or ff. [i] ii—l numbered, vi not numbered. Title red and black, enclosed in a border of four pieces, black letter, with a few ornamental capitals.

Collation:

Ai *recto*, Title.

Ai *verso*, The Prologue, which ends Aiii *recto*, ff. [i] *verso* to iii *recto*.

Aiii *verso*, The text begins, and ends Gii *recto*, or ff. iii *verso* to l *recto*.

Gii *verso*, The Table, which ends Gvi *verso*.

Gvii *recto*, Senſuyuent aulcunes receptes | de nouueau adiouxtees. | ends Gviii *recto*. *Verso* is blank.

The colophon follows the text on Gii *recto*, f. l:

¶ Cy finiſt ce preſent liure intitu | le la decoration dhumaine natu- | re. Nouuellemēt imprime a Lyon | en la maiſon de Claude veycellier | en rue merciere a lenſeigne ſainct | Jehan baptiſte. Et fut acheue le | xxiiii. iour de Auril. Mil cinq cēs | trente et deux.

The type used in this edition is well shaped and vigorous, but as the margins are narrow the page has a plethoric look. The title page, with its alternating red and black ink and ornamental border, has a rather rich appearance. I have met with no other copy, but it is mentioned by Brunet.

23. The last of the copies which I have seen is in the British Museum (7441, a. (2)):

La decora- | tion Dhumaine nature, & aorne- | ment des dames, Compile & ex- | traict des treſexcellens docteurs | et expers medecins, tant an- | ciēs que modernes, par Maiſtre | Andre le Fournier docteur regēt | en la faculte de Medecine en Lu | niuerſite de Paris. |

¶ Itē pluſieurs ſouueraines Re | ceptes tāt en lart de medecine que | pour faire ſauons, pouldres, & pō | mes redolentes. Auſſi pluſieurs | eaues prouffitables a lauer & net | toyer tant les corps que les abil- | lemens, leſquelles preſeruent de | toute corruption. |

¶ On les vend a Lyon par Thi | bault Payen. |

Small 8vo. Signatures: A to F in eights; or ff. xliij numbered from the beginning, *i.e.* A—Fiij; the remaining five leaves are not numbered. Title all in black, with woodcut border. Black letter of somewhat angular appearance.

Collation:

Ai *recto*, Title.

Ai *verso*, The Prologue, ends Aiij *recto*, or f. iij *recto*.

Aiij *recto*, The text begins, and ends Fv *recto*, which is not numbered, though it is in reality f. xliiij.

Fv *verso*, The table, ends Fviij *verso*.

Immediately after the text Fv *recto* is the colophon:

¶[Cy finiſt ce preſent liure intitu-|le decoration dhumaine natu-|re. Nouuellemēt imprime a Lyon | Par Thibault Payen. Et fut | acheue le ſeptieſme iour de moys|de Aouſt. Mil. v. cens trente & ſept. |

In this edition the extra receipts, which in the 1531 and 1532 editions follow the table, are printed before the table, but their titles are not included in it.

The most noteworthy circumstance connected with the editions is that though the book first came out at Paris, these subsequent editions were all printed at Lyons.

24. Besides the editions of 1530, 1531, and 1532, Brunet* enumerates the following: 1533, Paris, Pierre Leber; 1536, Lyons, François Juste; 1537, Lyons, Morice Roy and L. Pesnot, but with 1536 and the name of Juste at the end, so that this would seem to be the previous edition with a new title page; 1541, Lyons, Huguetan; 1545, Lyons, Chaussard; and 1582, Lyons.

In his account of the 1530 edition he makes some mistakes: "Petit volume composé de 10 ff. prélim. . . . , et de lvj ff. chiffr. pour le texte, sign. aa et A—G . . ." There are in reality 12 preliminary leaves, and there is another signature: a.

In the *Supplément*† the account of the first edition is fuller and more accurate, mention being made of the woodcuts and of the contents of signature a. The edition of 1536 is styled "charmante." The edition of 1537, Lyons, Thib. Payen, which is in the British Museum, is added to

---

* *Manuel*, Paris, 1862, III. 932.

† *Supplément*, Paris, 1878, I. 818.

the list, and of the 1541 edition, Lyons, Gilles et Jacques Huguetan, the only copy alluded to is that in the Méon catalogue.*

Brunet mentions an undated Lyons edition by Veycellier, as well as that of 1531, but it is possible that these two are the same, and that the date, which happens to be at the end, has been overlooked. An undated edition, however, quite possibly exists.

Brunet's first article, with a few verbal alterations, was reprinted, blunders and all, by Graesse. The supplemental article of course could not be included.

25. [May, 1898. Among those of Italian origin in my first Supplement (*Transactions*, N. S., II., p. 382) I drew attention to a very early treatise on dyeing by Gioanventura Rosetti, called *Plictho*, and said that only one edition had appeared. That is not correct, for there is a 4to reprint of 1611, and I have just got another.

> Libro di Tentoria Intitolata Plicto, Che insegna à tenger Panni, Lana, Tele, Bambasi, Aze, Sede, . . . Et l'Arte di conzar, e colorir Corami, & camozzar Pelle, . . . Col modo di far Aque per scriuere e miniare, colorir Osi, Legni &c. Nouamente arichito di belliffimi Secreti vtiliffimi á ogni qualità di perfone. . . .
>
> In Venetia. Preffo li Zattoni. A Rialto . . . 1672.
>
> Small 12mo; sigs. A to K in twelves; or, pp. [1-5] 6-228 [12]. It is got up in the same size and style as the *Recettario di Galeno* of 1683 (see § 4 above), of the *Secreti* by Venturini, 1672 (see Supplement I. § 41) and others. It was the fashion of the time.

Compared with the original it exhibits a great falling off, but, on the other hand, it is enlarged in one or two places.

It is surprising how regularly books degenerate after their first appearance.]

26. No nation of Europe surpassed the Italians in the production of receipt books, of one sort or other.

Here is one more example, which I found in the British Museum (1168, e. 8 (1)).

---

* *Catalogue des Livres Précieux, Singuliers et Rares, tant imprimés que Manuscrits, qui composaient la Bibliothèque de M* * *, . . . A Paris, chez Bleuet jeune, Librarie, place de l'Ecole, No. 45. 1803, 8vo. P. 108, No. 901. The Méon collection contained a number of very rare books of Secrets.

Opera Nova | Piacevole Laqvale | Insegna Di Far Varie | compositioni odorifere per far | bella ciaſchuna donna. | Et agiontoui molti ſecreti neceſſarii | alla ſalute humana como in la ta- | bula ſe contiene. Intitulata | Venvsta. |

[Device of Tobit and the Angel, as in the *Dificio*, 1550, by the same printers. That in the *Recettario*, 1528, and in Michael Scotus' *Physonomia* is different.]

In Vinegia appreſſo di Franceſco Bin- | doni, & Mapheo Paſini. | M. D. L. |

Small 8vo. A to D in fours; or, ff. 15 numbered, and 1 not numbered. Roman character.

A1, Title. *Verso*: Evstachio Celebrino alli Lettori.

A2 *recto*, The Text begins, and ends Dii *verso*.

Diii *recto*, Tabula begins, and ends Div *recto*. The *verso* is blank.

At the foot of Div *recto* is the colophon:

([A laude de lo eterno Dio: & vtilita del ſeme humano, | Finiſſe la eccellentisſima opera intitulata Venuſta | Stampata ne la inclita Citta di Vinegia per | Franceſco Bindoni, & Mapheo Paſi- | ni compagni. Nelli anni del Si- | gnore. M. D. L.

It is a small collection of cosmetic secrets: to make unguents, washes, soaps, perfumes, wines, to beautify the skin, hair, teeth; and there are others on subjects similar to some in Albertus. A work on the theme of the present volume appeared in a French translation in 1561, of which there is a notice below (§ 43). I have not been able to compare the two, and do not know if the whole or any part of the Italian was included in that translation. In any case, the French book is larger than the Italian one, and the author must therefore have had other sources to draw upon.

27. [May, 1898. In the first Supplement (§ 21)* there was a notice of a little book on the art of perfumery printed at Venice in 1555. I have just got another edition of the same tract.

Notandissimi | Secreti De d'Arte | Profvmatoria, | Per far Ogli, Acque, Paſte, Balle, Moſcardini, Vccel- | letti, Paternoſtri, e tutta l'arte intiera, | come ſi ricerca, | Coſi nella città di Napoli del Reame, come in | Roma, e quini (*sic*) in la città di Vinegia | nuouamente ristampati. | Con Privilegio. | [Devicē: Two cupids holding laurel wreaths, flying above a cloud, with the motto ET ANIMO ET CORPORI; enclosed in a scroll border.] In Venetia. |

Small 8vo. Signatures: A to K in eights; or, ff. 74, and table [6]. After the table the colophon:

In Venetia appreſſo Franceſco Rampazetto, | M. D. LX. | Printed in italics.

At the foot of f. 73 *verso* is the note: E tutte queſte coſe ſon compoſte per Gio- | uanni Ventura Roſeto Veneto. |

---

* *Transactions*, N. S., II., p. 386.

I suggested that this might be the author of the work on dyeing, entitled *Plictho*, printed by Rampazetto in 1540. There is everything in support of such a supposition.

After having compared them, I have found, as I anticipated, that the 1555 and 1560 editions of the present book are not identical.]

28. Books of medical secrets, from the very nature of man's interest in health, have been prominent in previous lists. They are not, however, always constructed on the same lines, but present considerable variety in their discussion of the theme. While, for example, the works of Varignana and Valescus de Taranta * deal with diseases and their treatment and cure, the *Treasure of Evonymus* contains the methods of preparing the remedies for use in treating diseases.

This work, *Thesaurus Evonymi de Remediis Secretis*, had a considerable circulation, not only in Latin, but in the vernacular of several nations. It was certainly written by Conrad Gesner; for, although his name does not appear anywhere in the first edition, 1552, it does so in the second, 1554. It is, moreover, distinctly assigned to him by Placcius † and other writers on anonymous and pseudonymous books, and, if it needed any confirmation the title of the second division of the work would supply it amply.

29. A copy of an undescribed edition, absent too from the Museum Catalogue, has to be added to the roll of the issues of this book. It is a small square 16mo, pp. 567 [41], and bears date, Venice, 1556. I have some doubt about the date of this volume, and a very great deal about the place. From the whole fashion of the book it seems to have been produced at Lyons, like the formerly-described editions of 1554 and 1555.‡

* Supplement II., *Transactions of the Archæological Society of Glasgow*, 1897, III., p. 191 and p. 206.

† *Theatrum Anonymorum et Pseudonymorum*, Hamburg, i. 1708, folio; Part 2, p. 266, Number 981. I can hardly think Gesner intended any concealment. If he did so it soon came to an end, for he appears as the author in Simler's Epitome. See *Bibliotheca Instituta et Collecta Primum a Conrado Gesnero Deinde in epitomen redacta ... per Iosiam Simlerum*. Tiguri, 1574, small folio. The first part of Evonymus occurs on p. 138, col. 2, line 42; the second part on p. 142, col. 1, line 57. The same references apply to the edition of the Bibliotheca: *Amplificata per Iohannem Iacobum Frisium*, Tiguri, 1583.

‡ Part V., p. 444. Part I., p. 188. Part III., p. 218.

It has no colophon and no printer's name, which in itself is a suspicious circumstance. The woodcuts of plants and apparatus are of inferior execution, so that it has all the look of a surreptitiously-printed edition, wherever it was done.

30. In my first reference of all to Gesner (Part I., p. 188) the second part of the *Treasure* was mentioned, but at that time only the English translation and Liebaut's adaptation or paraphrase in French could be shown. At last, however, a copy of the Latin original has made its appearance. Its title leaves no doubt as to its authorship:

> Conradi Gesneri . . . Euonymus, ſiue de Remedijs ſecretis, pars ſecunda: nunc primum opera & ſtudio Caspari Wolphii . . . in lucem editus.

The colophon states that it was printed at Zürich, by Christopher Frosch (*sic*), in 1569. It is in small octavo, ff. [8] 247 [16, and 1 blank?]. The copy I have is in poor condition, but a book, one example of which occurs once in twenty years, cannot be prudently rejected by the bibliographer because it is not exactly in the state a fastidious collector demands.* There is a copy of this first edition in the Museum, but that is the only other I know of at present.

31. Of the translation into French by Jean Liebaut I have got two editions. One was printed at Lyons in 1593; it was mentioned in my first list,† but I had no example. The other has had the date unfortunately cut off, but it may have been printed at Paris, and, so far as one can judge prior to 1593. Two Paris editions are mentioned: 1573 and 1578 *chez Jacques Dupuys*. In the absence of a date, this edition can be identified only by a full description. The title, which is printed in black and red and has a vignette of a furnace and distilling apparatus, is as follows:

> Quatre Livres | Des Secrets | De Medecine, Et | De La Philosophie | Chimiqve. Faicts Francois Par | M. Iean Liebaut Dijonnois, Docteur | Medecin à Paris.

---

* However, I am not quite sure that there is not a special interest attaching to a volume of this kind, which has obviously been maimed in the discharge of the duty which it was created to perform; but I admit that I should have preferred a clean copy, uncut if possible.

† Part I., p. 188.

Eſquels ſont deſcrits pluſieurs remedes ſinguliers pour | toutes maladies, tant interieures qu'exte- | rieures du corps humain. | Traictees bien amplement les manieres de diſtiller eaux, huiles, | & quintes eſſences de toute ſorte de matieres, preparer | l'Antimoine & la poudre de Mercure: faire les ex- | tractions les ſels artificiels, & l'or potable. | [Vignette of a still.]

Small 8vo. ã, A to Z, Aa to Qq, all in eights (but ãviij and Qqviij are wanting in this copy) or ff. [8, 1 wanting], 297, [15, 1 wanting]. The woodcuts of apparatus all very closely copied from the original, but are not identical with them. Further, as showing that some care has been employed, they are not reversed.

Liebaut's preface is dated 1573. In it he says that, having perused the second part of *Evonymus*, edited by Wolphius, he had paraphrased and supplemented it for the use of apothecaries, so that they might make their distillations better. Comparison, however, with the original Latin shows that Liebaut has not departed materially from Gesner's text.

Both parts may be regarded as forming a treatise on the preparation of substances by distillation, with their uses in chemistry and medicine, and, in fact, the work to a large extent deals with pharmaceutical chemistry.

32. I could now give notices of a considerable number of editions of the Secrets of Alexis which have come before me from time to time. Among these is one printed at Pesaro, "per Bartolomeo Cesano," 1559, containing the first and second parts. The first part is a reprint of what appeared at the same place in 1557, already referred to. The 1559 edition is not mentioned in any catalogue I have seen. There is a copy of the first French translation of the first part, printed at Antwerp by Plantin in 1557; the first Dutch translation also by Plantin in 1561; an Italian edition of the whole four parts, Venice, 1639; a French edition of the whole four parts, Lyons, 1639; another in 16mo, Rouen, 1627, and in 8vo, Rouen, 1691. The later French editions contain the translation of the *Kunst-buch* to which reference has been made so often.* It is not contained in the Italian. As I intend an account of these editions to be included in a separate paper † on Alexis the preceding will suffice on this ccasion.

* Part I., p. 192; *Proceedings of the Philosophicql Society of Glasgow*, 1888, XIX., p. 126.

† The first part, dealing with the biography of Alexis, was read to the Society of Antiquaries, London, February 11th, 1897. The second part, devoted to the Bibliography, was read, February 10th, 1898, to the same Society.

33. An author, whose name occurs now and again in catalogues attached to a collection of prodigies of nature, is Pierre Boaistuau. Two of his productions have fallen into my hands, the *Histoires Prodigieuses* and the English translation of the *Theatre du Monde.* Though quite familiar to me by name I had not had the curiosity to look at his writings till I had got these copies. No sooner, however, had I examined the former than I recognized both in the text and illustrations the closest resemblance to Fenton's *Secret Wonders of Nature*, and a brief comparison soon proved that Fenton's book was a translation of Boaistuau's, and not an original work as I formerly supposed.* This fact has obliged me to include it now as a book on the secrets of nature, analogous to those of Polydore Vergil, Obsequens, Jonstonus, and others.

With regard to the *Theatre du Monde* it fortunately does not belong to the literature now under review, for it is one of the most sombre books it has been my lot to come across for many a day. The pessimism of the passing moment is sunshine compared with the gloom of Boaistuau's outlook.

34. Of the author, what little is known is recorded by La Croix du Maine and Du Verdier.† The orthography of his name has been a puzzle to Frenchmen and foreigners alike; indeed I am not convinced that the bearer of it was himself quite sure about it. In the editions of the *Histoires Prodigieuses* of 1566, 1576, 1594, 1598 he is called Pierre Boaistuau; of 1571, Boaisteau. La Croix du Maine calls him Pierre Boistuau; Du Verdier, Boaistuau. The forms Boystuau and Boastuau are said to occur, and Lenglet Dufresnoy uses the forms Boiaistuaux,‡ Boiestuaux,§ and Boistuaux.‖ In Dutch it is Bosteau; in Spanish, Bouistau. Alday calls

---

* Part IV., p. 306.

† *Les Bibliothéques Françoises de la Croix du Maine et de Du Verdier, sieur de Vauprivas; Nouvelle Edition, . . . revue corrigée et augmentée . . . par M. Rigoley de Juvigny, . . .* Paris, 1772-73, in six vols. 4to. Du Maine's article is in Tome II., pp. 254-256; Du Verdier's, Tome V., p. 237. The extracts from Boaistuau, Tome V., pp. 238-242.

‡ *Recueil de Dissertations, Anciennes et Nouvelles, sur les Apparitions, les Visions & les Songes*, Avignon & Paris, 1752, T. IV., p. 228.

§ *Ibid.*, T. I., p. 131; IV., p. 244.

‖ *Ibid.*, T. IV., p. 296.

him both Boaistuau and Bouaystuau. The natural outcome of this bewildering variety is that the *Biographie Universelle* contains two quite distinct notices of him! One is under the spelling Boaistuau, and is in Tome IV., 1843, p. 477, by A. Beuchot and De Noual la Houssaye. The other is under Boistuau de Launai, in the same volume, p. 607, and is by La Fontanelle. Both are founded on what is said by La Croix du Maine and Du Verdier, and contain practically the same statements, though they differ in certain details. But the funny thing is that the two have been gravely inserted in perfect good faith and in apparent ignorance of one another!

35. Boaistuau, which seems to be the best authenticated spelling, called Launai, or Launay, or Lawney—even here there is want of unanimity—was a native of Nantes in Brittany. He may have been born towards the close of the fifteenth century or in the early years of the sixteenth. He died at Paris in 1566, and was buried in the "Cimetiere des Écoliers," near the Church of S. Estienne du Mont.

La Croix du Maine calls him "homme très-docte & des plus éloquens Orateurs de son siècle, & lequel avoit une façon de parler autant douce, coulante & agréable qu'autre duquel j'aye leu les écrits."* He is praised for his French style, which is in marked contrast with that of Belleforest, who wrote a continuation of the *Histoires tragiques* as well as of the *Histoires prodigieuses*. This merit, if no other, seems to have carried some of his books through numerous editions. A list of them is given by both the writers mentioned. They include: *Théâtre du Monde*, of which there were more than twenty editions, besides translations into Latin, English, German, and Spanish. In the British Museum are editions of 1561, 1562, 1571, 1577, 1595; in Latin, 1589; in German, 1606; in Spanish, 1593; in English by John Alday, 1566(?), 1574, 1581, 1663. The copy I have is of the 1581 edition. It is a small 8vo volume, printed at London by Thomas East for John Wyght; and it is in black letter. It has Wyght's device of a man in a doctor's gown and cap with the punning motto, instead of East's crest of the black horse, as in

* Ubi sup., II., p. 254.

Batman's Bartholomew Glanville's *De Proprietatibus Rerum*, 1582.* The title runs thus:

> Theatrum Mundi. The Theatre or rule of the World, wherein may be seene the running race & course of euery mans life, as touching miserie and felicitie, . . . wherevnto is added a learned and pithie worke of the excellency of man, written in the French and Latine tongues by Peter Boaistuau, Englished by John Alday, & by him . . . corrected and amended, . . .

36. *Histoires tragiques*, from the Italian of Bandello, went through an "infinity of editions." *Les Amants Fortunés*, is a translation apparently from the Heptameron. *Traité de la paix et de la guerre*; *Traité de l'Eglise Militante*; *L'Histoire de Chelidonius*, 1559; *Visions prodigieuses*, in Lenglet Dufresnoy's work above quoted, 1752, T. I., are also by him.

Some works were left in manuscript, including a translation of St. Augustine's *Cité de Dieu* and a *Traité des pierres précieuses*, in which are discussed the nature of genuine precious stones, and the tricks and impostures practised with false ones. I should have liked much to see what he had to say on this last subject and the sources from which he drew his information.

37. His *Traite de l'excellence & dignité l'homme* was printed along with the *Théâtre du Monde*, and it forms the second part of Alday's translation above mentioned. Two or three extracts from these are given at the end of Du Verdier's article,† by which some notion may be formed of his style. It seems certainly simple, easy, and dignified.

But De la Monnaye has a different estimate of him. "Il a passé (he says) dans son temps pour un beau parleur, avoit quelque lecture, du reste fort superficiel, ne sachant absolument point de Grec, & n'entendant qu'assez médiocrement le Latin." One example is given from his "Excellency of Man," where he takes Clazomenae, the native place of Hermotimus, for Hermotimus himself!

Du Verdier's article is nothing more than a list of Boaistuau's writings.

38. The *Histoires prodigieuses*, the work which, in consequence of

---

* Supplement II., *Trans. Archæol. Soc.*, Glasgow, III., 1897, p. 189.

† Ubi sup. T. V., p. 237.

Fenton's having adapted and adopted it, now claims our attention (as it seems to have done that of the author's contemporaries), ran through a number of editions. I find mention of the following:

1556, apparently the first edition, 1557, 1560, 1561, 1564, 1566, 1567, 1568, 1571, 1574, 1575, 1576, 1594, 1598.

Of these there are in the British Museum:

1566. Paris, Vincent Norment & Jeanne Bruneau, 8vo. It contains only Boaistuau's work, and has clear woodcut illustrations.

1571. Paris, Jean de Bordeaux, 16mo. It contains Boaistuau, Tesserant, and Belleforest, with quite small cuts.

1576 (misprinted 1756 in the B. M. Catalogue). Paris, Charles Macé, 8vo. A page for page reprint of the 1566 edition, with Belleforest's histories added. The cuts are very poor.

1594. Anvers, Guislain Janssens, 12mo. It contains Boaistuau, Tesserant, Belleforest, and Hoyer. It is very closely printed, and the woodcuts are much reduced in size.

1598. Paris, la Vefue Guillaume Cavellat, in six small volumes, square 16mo. To those in the 1594 edition are added Arnaud Sorbin (translated by Belleforest) and "I. D. M.," from various authors. It is a neat collection, with passable woodcuts.

39. The copy which I have is not in the Museum.

Histoires Prodigievses, Extraictes de Plvsieurs fameux Autheurs, Grecs & Latins, sacrez & Prophanes, diuisees en deux Tomes. Le premier mis en lumiere par P. Boistuau, surnommé Launay, natif de Bretagne. Le second par Claude de Tesserant, & augmenté de dix histoires par François de Belle-Forest Comingeois. Auec les pourtraicts & figures. [Device.]

A Paris, chez Iean de Bordeaux au cloz Bruneau, à l'enseigne de l'Occasion. 1574. Auec priuilege du Roy.

Two volumes 16mo. Vol. I. ff. [8], 1-216; Vol. II. ff. [4], 217-278, [3], 279-396 [4]. The woodcuts are small, but tolerably sharp. This seems to be simply a reprint of the edition of 1571, by the same publisher.

40. The Spanish translation was made by Andrea Pescioni from "Bouistau," Tesserant, and Belleforest. It appeared at Medina del Campo, 1586, small square 8vo, and Madrid, 1603, in the same form. These contain no cuts, and are poorly printed. What little there is to say about the English translation will be included in the next supplement.

41. The Dutch translation [B. M. 12430, aa. 17] is entitled:

Het wonderlijcke Schadt-Boeck der Historien... Dordrecht, 1592, in small 8vo. It is in black letter, and the woodcuts are small and blurred. It is in four parts, with separate pagination, but the signatures are continuous.

There is another work [B. M. 7002, a] entitled: *Toonneel der Gedenkwaardigste Wonderen, Geschiedenissen en Vreemdigheden, uyt de Heer Bosteau en anderen dus in beknopt Duyts gestelt door Jan van Duisberg, Boek-verkooper*, Amsterdam, 1657, 18mo. It is a collection in 23 chapters of remarkable things, mainly in natural history. The subjects are the following: Stones, the load-stone, the satyrs of Bosgoden, burning mountains, wonderful and terrible deaths, examples of avarice, memorable changelings (mis-births), strange banquets, the lion and the slave, strange lives, strange snakes, visions and ghostly appearances, plants and roots, wonderful cruelties, strange properties of waters, peculiarities and acts of dogs, the cause of monsters, plants and stones which resemble certain animals, bees and ants, the likeness and unlikeness of men, wonderful fish and water animals, earthquakes and their causes.

This is an interesting book, which might well go along with the *Secret de l'hystoire naturelle*, but it is not a translation of Boaistuau, though some of the prodigies may have been taken from him.

42. The work which follows is a general collection of receipts, and though the book is not bulky, it is so closely printed that it contains a great amount of matter. About the author there is nothing to say, except that some writers hint at his identity with Hieronymo Ruscelli, who claims to be the true Alessio of Piedmont. But, so far as I am aware, there is no evidence in support of this notion.

It may be observed that Bariletto was also the publisher of the *Secreti* of Isabella Cortese. That book appeared in 1561,* and has the same device on the title page. The demand for such books was apparently so great that a publisher was not afraid to send out possible competitors for public favour on the same lines.

Della Svmma | De' Secreti Vniversali | In Ogni Materia | Parte Prima. Di Don Timotheo Rossello, Si | per huomini & donne, di alto ingegno, come an-|

* Supplement I., p. 390.

cora per medici, & ogni ſorte di artefici in- | duſtrioſi, & a ogni perſona vir- | tuoſa accommodate. | Con gratia, & priuilegio. | [Device.]

In Vinegia Per Giouanni Bariletto. M D LXI. |

Small 8vo. Parte Prima. Signatures: *, A to T in eights; or, ff. [8], 152. The device is a draped female holding a hand mirror.

At the end of the text, 152 *recto*:

In Venetia apreſſo Giouanni Bariletto. | M. D. LXI. |

152 *verso*: the device repeated, as in the *Secreti* of Isabella Cortese, 1561.

The second part has a separate title.

La Seconda Parte | De Secreti Vniversali | In Ogni Materia Di Don | Timotheo Rossello. | Ne' Qvali Si Contengono I | rimedi vtili à l'infermità, & altre coſe belliſsi- | me, ingenioſe & artificioſe, come nella | tauola veder potrai. | Con gratia & priuilegio. | [Device.]

In Venetia Per Giouanni Bariletto. | M D LXI. |

Signatures: †, A to T in eights; or, ff [8], 152. At the end of the text, 152 *recto*:

In Venetia apreſſo Giouanni Bariletto. | M.D.LXI.

152 *verso*: the device is again repeated.

43. Another rare work is concerned, like Fournier's and so many others, with secrets of the toilet. One of the copies is in the British Museum (547, e, 8(2)), but I have not been successful in finding the Italian original.* There is no reason for doubting that this, like the *Batiment des receptes*, is really from the Italian. The copy which I have is of a later edition, and it will be observed that the title pages are different, and that both the fact of its being a translation and the initials of the translator—if that is the meaning of S. E. S. X.—have been deleted. It would seem, too, that the house and shop occupied by Victor Sertenas in 1561 were inhabited in 1566 by Victor Norment and Jeanne Bruneau, who have already appeared as issuing an edition of Boaistuau that same year. Was this a new firm, or had Sertenas changed his name to Norment? It would perhaps be considering too curiously to discuss the matter now, especially as I have no facts bearing on it; but it is a curious question. This is the copy I have seen in the British Museum.

Recveil De | Plvsievrs Secretz | treſvtiles, tant pour l'ornement que la | ſanté du corps humain, tirez des | plus excellens auteurs, tant | Grecz (*sic*) que Latins.| Avqvel

* See what is said on this subject under *Opera Nova Piacevole*, 1550 (§ 26).

Avons Adiovste | vn traicté des deſtillations, contenant pluſieurs | receptes d'eaues Imperiales, d'Ange, | Naffe & autres ſemblables:| Novvellement Tradvict | d'Italien en François, | Par S. E. S. X.| [Device.]

A Paris, | pour Vincent Sertenas Libraire, demeurant en la | rue neuue noſtre Dame, à l'image ſainct Iean l'E- | uangeliſte. Et en ſa boutique au Palais, en la gal-| lerie par ou on va à la Chancellerie.| M.D.LXI.| Avec Privilege.|

8vo. Signatures A to H in eights; or, ff. [1] 2-59 [5].

Ai title. Aij to Hiij Text. Hiiij to Hviij Table of Contents.

The first part contains receipts for beautifying the face, hands, and body.

The second for making soaps, violet powder, oil, odoriferous water, and various medical receipts.

Part three treats of distilled waters of various kinds, medical, fragrant, &c.

44. The next copy is in my own possession.

Recveil | De Plvsievrs | Secrets Tresexcel- | lens Et Admirables, | pour l'ornement & embelliſſement | de la face, & autres parties du corps.| Plvs, | Vn Traicte De La Maniere | de diſtiller eaux de ſenteurs, faire parfums, | pommes d'odeurs, & autre choſes | excellentes, par cy deuant | non cogneuës.| [Device.]

A Paris.| Pour Vincent Norment & Ieanne Bruneau, en la rue neu- | ue noſtre Dame, à l'image S. Iehan l'Euangeliſte, & au | Palais, en la galerie par ou on va à la Chancellerie.| M.D.LXVI.

Small 8vo. A to H in eights; or ff. 59, and 5 of table of contents. At the end: Acheve D'Imprimer | Le Cinqviesme Iovr | De Mars. M.D.LXVI.|

The device consists of two right hands out of clouds, clasping each other and holding a sheaf of arrows with the points downwards. In the ornamental border are the words: Vincenti Non Victo Gloria.

45. Still another Italian book on the same subject of personal adornment has to be noticed:

Gli | Ornamenti | Delle Donne | Tratti dalle Scritture d'una Reina Gre- | ca per M. Giovanni Ma- | rinello, & diuiſi in | quattro libri, | Con due Tauole, una de' Capitoli, e l'altra d'al- | cune coſe particolari. | Opera utile, & neceſſaria ad ogni gentile perſona. | Con Privilegio. | [Device.]

In Venetia Appreſſo Franceſco de' Fran- | ceſchi Seneſe. M.D.LXII. |

Small 8vo. *, A to Z, AA to RR in eights; or, ff. [8] 319, [f blank]. The device is Peace, a draped female holding up an olive branch in her right hand and an inverted torch in her left, enclosed in a scroll-border. On the *verso* of RRvij are the "Registro" and colophon: In Venetia | Appreſſo Franceſco de Franceſchi Seneſe, Al ſe- | gno de la Pace. M.D.LXII. |

The four books—the contents of which are not very strictly discriminated—contain respectively methods of removing defects which interfere with the symmetry of the body, the hair and everything connected with its

preservation, improvement, and colour, the face and various secrets for making it "beautiful for ever," and, in the fourth book, the rest of the body. It is comprehensive and elaborate, and it is to be hoped that the Italian ladies duly appreciated the efforts of the author, which were put forth for the express purpose of pleasing them and assisting them in the great work of making themselves even more beautiful than they were already.

46. The acquisition of several copies of Levinus Lemnius' curious collection of wonders and secrets carries me back to my first paper on the present subject.* At that time I did not know the date of the first edition.

The earliest which I have as yet seen, came into my hands a little time ago.

Levini Lem- | nii Medici Zirizaei | Occvlta Natvræ Mira- | cula, ac varia rerum documenta, probabili | ratione atque artifici coniectura duobus | libris explicata, quæ ſtudioſo aui- | doq́; Lectori non tam vſui | ſunt futura, quàm ob- | lectamento. | Elenchus operis, horum omnium | gustum exhibebit. [Device.]
Antverpiae, | Apud Guilielmum Simonem. | Cum Priuilegio. | 1561. |
Small square 8vo. Sigs. ȷ, A to X in eights, Y in four; or ff. [16] 164. The device is a lad who having plundered a bee-hive is set upon by bees; with the motto: Dvlcia Mixta Malis.

Notwithstanding its date I am nearly certain that there must be an earlier edition. The author's epistle dedicatory is dated December, 1558, and the privilege April, 1559; so I should suppose the first edition came out about the middle of 1559. It contains only two books; the later editions have four.

47. It was reprinted by Plantin at Antwerp in 1564, in 12mo, and it must have been in demand, for another edition came out in 12mo, in 1567. These two editions I have not seen, but I have here a copy of the edition of 1574, which was also published by Plantin. It is an 8vo, pp. [16] 566 [for 582] [33, 1 blank], printed in italics, with the device of the compass on the title page. The Dutch words which occasionally occur, are printed in a peculiar black-letter, which is much more striking than that employed in

* Part I., p. 187. [Reprint, 1896, p. 10.]

the 1581 edition formerly described. The present copy is also in contemporary binding of fine smooth light-brown calf, with the initials D. M. and the date 1575.

48. Even more interesting are the three earliest editions of Gohory's French translation:

Les | Occvltes | Merveilles Et Se- | cretz De Natvre, Avec Plv- | ſieurs enſeignemens des choſes diuerſes tant | par raiſon probable que par coniecture arti- | ficielle: expoſées en deux liures de nõ moin- | dre plaiſir que proufit au lecteur ſtudieux.| Par | Leuin Lemne Medecin Zirizeen, & nouuellement tra- | duit de Latin en François, par I. G. P. | Avec deux tables, lune des argumens | des chapitres, l'autre des ſingu- | lieres matieres d'iceux.|

A Paris, | Par Pierre du Pré, Libraire iuré en l'vniuer- | ſité, au premier pillier de la grand | ſalle du palais.| M.D.LXVII.| Auec priuilege du Roy.|

It is a small 8vo. Sigs. A to Z, and Aa to Dd, ã, ẽ, all in eights; or, pp. [28] 402 [2] [32]. Gohory's preface dated Paris, 2 February, 1567, would show that this is the first edition. The present one is the Yemeniz copy, and it has the book plate.

49. This was reprinted at Orleans by Pierre Trepperel in the following year, 1568, in a square 16mo. The copy in the Hunterian Museum was described in my very first paper on the subject, but a little time ago a copy of this very rare volume came into my possession. It agrees with the description already given.*

50. Another edition, probably the second, was published at Paris in 1574. The title is the same as the other, but the page is differently arranged; there is a vignette of a galley with oars and sails and shields and a covered poop, and the book was printed at Paris: Pour Galiot du Pré, Rue S. Iaques, à l'enſeigne de la Gallere d'or. This also is in 8vo, signatures A to Z, Aa to Cc in eights, Dd in four, ✠, *, in eights, * in four; or ff. [1], 212, [20].

Galiot du Pré was doubtless some relative of Pierre, who printed the first edition. In this later edition the numbering of the leaves has been introduced; an archaism all the more singular that in the first edition it is the pages which are numbered. All three editions are attractive.

* Part I., p. 187, but *Paris* is incorrectly given as the place instead of Orleans.

51. In the first paper * of all on this subject I gave an account of a tiny volume entitled *Künstbüchlin*, and afterwards showed that, with certain modifications, it appeared in whole or in part in numerous subsequent editions, and was translated into French, Dutch, Danish, and English. The name, however, was used by other compilers, and was given to books of receipts differing from the series referred to, although resembling them in subject and in treatment.

One of these has come before me, and it may be described, to distinguish it from the others.

Kunstbüchlin. | Wie man auff | Marmelstein, Kupffer, Mes- | sing, Zihn, Stal, Eisen, Har- | nisch vnd Waffen, etc. Etzen, vnd | künstlich vergülden sol. | Mit vorgehendem Bericht: | Wie man Dinten, Pre- | silgen, vnd alle Metalfarben zum | schreiben, Mancherey (*sic*) Farben, Parge- | ment vnd Federn zu ferben, Alle Metallen aus | der Federn zu schreiben, Golt vnd Silber Fun- | damentlein, vnd Goltwasser auff allerley | Ballerey, vnd dergleichen mehr, ma- | chen vnd Temperiren sol. Zu dienst vnd Ehren allen | Schreibern, Auch den vnerfarnen der | Etzkunst, zusamen bracht | Durch Andream Helmreich, Rechen- | meister zu Hall. | Von newem vbersehen, gemeh- | ret vnd gebessert. | 1574. |

Small 8vo. A to E in eights, F four, or, ff. [44]. Title red and black.

Fiiij *recto*, the colophon:

Gedruckt zu Witteberg, | Durch Lorentz | Schwenck. | 1574.

The detailed title page saves one the trouble of describing the contents of this little tract.

52. It is no easy matter apparently to exhaust the editions of Wecker's Secrets. Here are some new ones.

De Secretis Libri XVII. Ex variis authoribus collecti, methodiceque digesti, & aucti per Ioan. Iacobvm Vveckervm, Basiliensem, Medicum Colmariensem. Accessit Index locupletissimus. Cum Gratia & Priuilegio. [Device.]

Basileae, Ex Officina Pernea CIↃIↃXXCIIX.

Small 8vo. Signatures:)(in eight, a to z, A to Z, Aa to II in eights, KK2; or, pp. [16], 865, and Index [30].

Wecker's epistle dedicatory to Baron Lazarus Svendius is dated: Colmar, August 1st, 1582.

The edition of 1701, already mentioned, is a simple reprint of this.

---

* Part I., p. 192. *Proceedings of the Philosophical Society of Glasgow*, 1888, vol. xix., p. 126, and Supplement, 1894, vol. xxv., p. 224.

Wecker's collection has been taken from all the old Secret writers, and is an excellent handbook to them.

Whether the present is the first edition or not, I am not certain, but considering the date of the dedicatory epistle, as well as of the French translation, I should suppose there was one earlier edition, if not more.

53. The translation of the book into French seems to have been taken in hand at once by Pierre Meyssonier, for the dedication of it by him to Hierosme de Chatillon is dated: Lyons, January 1st, 1584. This translation might, of course, have been made from a MS., but there is no evidence of that, and, anyhow, it is simpler to suppose that he had a printed edition before him. This would involve a Latin edition of 1582 or 1583, corresponding, therefore, to the date of Wecker's dedication, but I have not seen one so early. Nor do I know for certain when this translation was first published, but I should suppose that it must have been in 1584, the year of the dedication. I should also infer, from what is said on the title page of the following French copy, which is the earliest that I have seen, that the book passed through several editions in the ten years subsequent to the date of the dedication.

The title referred to is as follows:

> Les Secrets Et Merveilles De Nature, Recueillis de diuers Autheurs, & diuiſez en XVII. liures, Par Iean Iacqves Vuecher, de Baſle, Medecin de Colmar. Traduicts en François, & corrigez outre les Impreſsions precedentes, ſelon la traduction Latine: Auec vne Table tres-ample. [Device.]
> A Lyon, pour Thomas Soubron, & Moyſe des Prez. 1596.

This is an octavo of pp. [16] 1086, 2 blank, [91] of index, and 5 blank. As the copy I have happens to be as clean and fresh as when it was printed, it looks well enough, but the paper is of the soft, porous kind so common in the cheap Lyons books of the time, and the page is not attractive.

54. Another followed in 1606, but here again I am unable to say if there were any in the interval. I should suppose there were.

> Les Secrets et Merveilles de Natvre. Recueillis de diuers Autheurs, & diuiſes en XVII. liures, Par Jean Jacques Vvecker, de Baſle, Medecin de Colmar. Traduits en François, ſelon la traduction Latine: Reueu, & corrigé de nouueau. Auec vne table tres-ample. [Device.]

A Tovrnon, Par Clavde Michel, & Thomas Sovbron. 1606.
8vo. Signatures: *, A to Z, Aa to Zz, Aaa to Zzz, Aaaa to Ffff, all in eights; Ffff 7 and 8 blank. Pagination: [16] 1246, [49, 5 blank].

The translation is Meysonnier's. The dedication to Hierosme de Chastillon is reprinted with the date: Lyon, January 1st, 1584. There is no difference between this and the earlier edition.

55. Another which I have is got up in the same style, but it professes to be improved:

Les | Secrets | Et Merveilles | De Natvre. | Recueillies de diuers Autheurs, & diuiſez | en XVII. Liures. | Par Iean Iacqves Wecker | de Baſle, Medecin de Colmar. | Liure non ſeulement neceſſaire aux curieux, ains à tous ceux qui | font profeſsion des Arts Liberaux, & ſubtiles inuentions: | tant pour l'exercice de l'Art Militaire, qu'autres | de quelques vacations qu'ils ſoient. | Reueu, corrigé, augmenté, & enrichy de pluſieurs figures, & mis en | meilleur ordre que les precedentes Impreſſions. | [Device.]
A Roven, | Chez Clavde Le Villain, Libraire & Relieur | du Roy, rue du Bec, à la bonne Renommee. | M. DC. XXVII. |
8vo. Signatures: †, A to Z, Aa to Zz, Aaa to Vvv; or, pp. [16] 1012 [41, 1 blank]. Title red and black.

This is on very soft paper, and has a dingy look. Notwithstanding its assertion I do not see any difference in the contents between this edition and that of 1596. The Dedication is left undated. Perhaps the publisher thought it was time to forget the fact that it went back to 1584.

56. When the English translation of Wecker was under consideration before (Part III., p. 225), editions of 1660 and 1661 were both mentioned. Having the 1661 edition only, I was unable to settle whether it was a "genuine second edition, or the original edition with a new-dated title page." I have now got the 1660 edition, and find that the second alternative is the correct one, namely that the 1660 title page has been cut out and the 1661 title page substituted, the book otherwise being the same; and further that both title pages bear the name of Dr. R. Read; so that Watt and Lowndes are wrong in calling him *Alexander*.

57. Almost contemporary with Cardan flourished Jean Bodin, known by his works on the study of history and on the Republic. He is also responsible for a book on Demonology in which he gave fair scope to

his superstitious credulity, his ignorance, his fear, and as a consequence his cruelty.

Not to be behind he too blossomed out as the expounder of creation. Having displayed such intimacy with the mysteries of the realms of darkness, he was Hegelian enough to know that he must balance it by a corresponding explanation of the world of light.

The *Theatrum Mundi*, as he called his book, first appeared in 1596, so far as I am aware.

Vniversae Natvræ Theatrum, In Qvo Rervm Omnivm effectrices caufæ, & fines quinque libris difcutiuntur, Avtore Ioan. Bodino,
Lvgdvni, Apvd Iacobvm Rovssin,
Typographum Regium. M. D. XCVI.
8vo. Sigs. ã4, A to Z, Aa to Qq in eights, Rr in four. Pp. [8] 633 [1 blank].

This book is decently printed, with liberal margins and spacing, which give it a handsome look.

58. Another edition came out later:

Hanoviae, Typis Wechelianis apud Claudium Marnium, & hæredes Ioann. Aubrii. M. DC. V.
8vo. Sigs.):(, A to Z, Aa to Qq in eights, Rr in four. Pp. [16] 633 [1 blank].

This is very nearly a line for line, page for page reprint of the 1596 edition. But the paper is not so good, the printing is inferior, and the margins are curtailed, so that the volume looks commonplace beside the other.

The conclusion is striking:

Finis Theatri Naturæ, quod Io. Bodinus Gallia tota bello ciuili flagrante confcripfit.

Both copies are in Sir William Hamilton's collection in the University Library.

59. The copy I myself have is of the French translation by François de Fougerolles. Like several of these encyclopædic surveys it is in the dialogue form. It is divided into five books: Elements; Earth, Air, Water; Plants and Animals; Souls and Capacities of Men; The Heavens, the Planets, etc. It comes in here, then, less as a work on technical secrets as on the secrets of nature and of natural history, and it goes along with such books as Cardan's just mentioned, and a good many others.

perched on the branch of a tree, and with the same motto, occurs in the *Kunst Boeck* of Symon Andrée, 1549.*

The book is divided into five parts: physignomy, of romero, of ardent water, secrets of natural things, secrets of the four elements, the heavenly bodies and their effects.

An interesting section of the book is the list of authorities upon whom the author has relied for the five tracts above mentioned.

Thus, for the first, he quotes Tisnerio, Escoto (Michael Scotus), and Pedro de Ribas. For the second and third: Arnaldus, Pliny, Herrera, "el maestro Zapata Cirurgico" (as to whom something has been already said in Supplement I., § 27), Galen, and many others, as Dioscorides, Theophrastus, Serapio, and Crecentinus. For the fourth: Mizaldus, Pliny, Cardan, Florentino, Albertus, Aranda, Porta, "y don Alexios Piamontes." For the last: Pliny, Alfraganus, Aristoteles—Principe de los Philosophos, with "an infinity of other authors."

This list also shows how books like the present were mere compilations and condensations from other writings, and contained no original matter and no criticism. They are, therefore, valuable now chiefly as commonplace books and as indices to their predecessors.

61. After existing for a century and a half, Cortes' book, harmless enough one would have thought, fell under the ban of the Inquisition. Here is a copy of such an edition:

Fisonomia, | y | Varios Secretos | De | Naturaleza, | Compuesto | Por Geromino Cortés, | natural de la Ciudad de Valencia. | Están Expurgados, Segun | lo manda el Decreto de la Santa | Inquisicion de 13 de Junio | del año de 1741. | Con Licencia. | Barcelona: Por Joseph Giralt Impresor, Pla- | za de Santa Ana. |

Small square 8vo, Signatures A to Q in eights, R four, or pp. [4] 260. The book has no date, but, of course, must be after 1741. After a rough comparison with the 1598 edition I do not see any evidence of expurgation. It may, however, be in the modification or removal of words or phrases that were thought objectionable.

---

* Part II., p. 263. *Proceedings of the Philosophical Society of Glasgow*, 1888, Vol. XIX., p. 137.

62. One of the most attractive of all the collections is the following, which is all the more so because such books in Dutch are not common:

Secreet-Boeck | Waer in vele diversche Secre- | ten, ende herrlicke Consten in veelder- | leye verscheyden materien, wt seker Latijnsche, | Fransoysche, Hoochduytsche, ende Nederlandt- | sche Authoren, te samen ende by een ghebracht | zijn: Waer van den meestendeel der voor- | schreven Authoren namen daer by | gheciteert worden. | [Device.]

Tot Dordrecht. | By Abraham Canin, Int | Jaer ons Heeren, 1601. |

Small 8vo, A to Z in eights, A to D in eights, and E, 1 leaf, or 4 pp. prelim. and text, pp. 419, so numbered, but pp. 180-189 (inclusive) are numbered twice. Black letter. The device is a lion holding a book.

The preliminary pages contain title, privilege, and author's preface.

The work contains secrets referring to almost every imaginable topic, and the names of the authorities are frequently given at the end of each. Among these are Mizaldus, Albertus, Fallopius, Cardanus, Fioravanti, Porta, Alexius, Isabella Cortese, Roscellus, Theophrastus (which?), Silvius, and others.

There are secrets of the fire, air, water, earth; of the mind, as to strengthen the memory; of the body; against divers sicknesses, in general, and in detail; cosmetics, wine; of sleep (opium was used); the secrets of beasts, horses, sheep, pigs, dogs; of wild animals, deer, hares, wolves, moles, weasels; ants, scorpions, fleas; serpents, and so on; of fishes; of birds; of flies; of plants, trees [and grafting] (a good deal of this from Mizaldus); of the vineyard; of root plants, radishes, etc.; flowers, fruits, seeds; metals, iron and steel, etc.; soldering; silvering and gilding; of sulphur; salt, glass; gardening; secrets of clothes, how to clean them; secrets of writing, of ink, of illuminating; of varnish; of gums and resins; Aurum Musicum; colours of various kinds—green, blue, white, etc.; Lutum Sapientie; to die thread or linen brown; to die skin, bone, and horn; secrets of the air and weather; signs of snow; signs of wind; of thunder and lightning; the cause of earthquakes; signs of great tempests; signs of a fruitful and unfruitful year; secrets of conserves and comfits, marmalade, etc.; secrets of cookery; secrets of compound distilled waters; secrets of metalline waters (nitric and other acids, etc.); secrets of balsams; of oils from seeds and from spices; of turpentine; of aqua vitæ.

It is a comprehensive and entertaining collection of old physical, chemical, and technical knowledge. The only copy of this edition which I have seen is in the British Museum, 1036, c. 3 (2).

63. Another, which I have, appeared in 1609, but whether it is the second or not, I am unable to say. The following is its title:

Secreet-Boeck | Waer in vele diversche Secretē | ende heerlicke Consten, in veelderleye | verscheyden materien, wt seker Latijnsche, Fran- | soysche, Hoochduytsche, ende Nederlandtsche Authoren, te | samen ende by een gebracht zijn: Waer van den mee- | stendeel der voorschreven Authoren namen | daer by gheciteert worden. | By een vergadert door D. Doctor Carel Batin. | [Device.]
Tot Dordrecht. | By *Joris Waters. Anno. 1609.*
Small 8vo. Signatures: A to Z in eights, pp. [4] 356 [7, 1 blank]. Black letter. The device is a Triton blowing on a conch; round the woodcut are the words: Stvdys Immortalitem Acqvirimvs.

So far as one can judge by a comparison of the table of the contents of the previous book as given with the present, this is a simple reprint. The most important point in this edition is the adding of the author's name. I cannot find it, however, in the biographical dictionaries so that it is possibly a pseudonym.

64. The following tiny chap-book I found in the British Museum, 1048 c. 4 (3):

Petit Traicté. Contenant plusieurs Secrets naturels, bien experimentez par l'Epagerie Tramontane, lesquels il en faict participant à tous ceux qui sont curieux de leur santé & qui desirent voir des belles curiositez.
A Aix, Par Iean-Courraud, & Philippe Coignat,
Imprimeurs ordinaires de ladite ville.
M. DC. VI.
Sm. 8vo, pp. 14.

Besides a few medical receipts there are some miscellaneous ones: the tree of Diana; to clean pearls; to dye white hair black with silver nitrate; to freeze wine with ice and saltpetre, and some more like these.

65. There is another chap-book similar to the preceding and to those already described in the first supplement:

Thesoro | Di Secreti | Natvrali | Dispensato da me Benedet- | to, detto il Persiano. |
[Vignette]
In Roma, | Appresso Giacomo Mascardi. | M.DC.IX. | Con licenza de' Superiori.

8vo. Signature A, 4 leaves. The title is surrounded by a border of separate scrolls. The vignette is an old bearded man holding his cheek with his hand. It may be a portrait of the author in meditation, but from the expression which the limner has put into it, I judge that he means it as a vivid delineation of the pain of toothache, and the desirability of buying the pamphlet for the sake of the cure.

This pamphlet contains only brief directions for the cure of some common diseases: boils, toothache, bleeding at the nose, the bite of a mad dog, scrofula, and so on. The remedies are for the most part derived from plants. It is a very singular assemblage of secrets.

66. As I have often had occasion to mention Neri's *Art of Glass*, first published at Florence in 1612, in 4to, I may refer to another edition with which I became acquainted a little time since. It shows how much esteemed the book was, as giving sound and accurate information on its subject, that it was printed so often as a sort of standard work. The edition to which I refer was included in the Italian translation of Baumé's *Chimie Expérimentale.* I have not seen this translation, but I have a copy of Neri's part, of which copies apparently were put separately in circulation. It is a small 8vo, pp. cxliii. [1 blank] with only a short title: *L'Arte Vetraria di Prete Antonio Neri*, without place, printer's name, and date. The appended licence to print the whole work of Baumé is, however, dated 1787, and is granted to "Francesco di Niccolò Pezzana, Stampator di Venezia." There is nothing of interest in the book itself, apart from its being another and comparatively late edition.

67. Godefroy Roussel, if such be his real name, is not noticed in any work that I have consulted, and a book of receipts is all that I know him by:

Les | Secrets | Descovverts | Des Arts, Tant De | Pharmatie que de celuy de Distiller, | vulgairement nommé Alchemie, | ou Spagirie: par le moyen deſquels | l'on paruient à la perfection; tant par | Theoricque que practique, à rẽdre | l'Or Potable, ſuccinctement dé- | duicts en forme de Dialogue. | Oeuure non moins neceſſaire que profitable | à tous Amateurs de ſcience. | De l'inuention de Godefroy Rovssel, | Maiſtre Appoticaire à Paris. | Dedié Av Roy.|

A Paris, | Et ſe vendent par l'Autheur, ruë de la Sauon- | nerie, entre la pierre au laict & la place aux | veaux: Chez Guillaume Baudeau, | Maiſtre Chandellier. 1613. | Auec Priuilege de ſa Majesté.|

Small 8vo. Signatures: †, †, ††, in fours, A to I in eights, K in four; or pp. [1]-7 [8-22] [2 blank], 138 (misprint for 147) [5].

The epistle to the reader is a defence of alchemy, which according to this author seems to be identical with chemical pharmacy. The first part contains an exposition of the general principles of pharmacy, classifications of the properties of drugs and their uses. The second book deals with the secrets of distillation, treated from a very lofty theoretical standpoint. An account of some preparations is given, and a good deal is said about potable gold and its "mystical" preparation. At the end there is a section on the sympathetic relation of man to the great world, and the doctrine of signatures is introduced.

The notable thing about this work is that the doctrines are expounded by an aspirant to the mastership in pharmacy, in the form of a disputation or maintenance of theses, before a master who commends his expositions and suggests new themes for him to discourse upon.

68. The inclusion of the following little volume in the present list requires possibly some justification, for it is in reality on chemistry, rather than on practical arts. However, as a section of it is concerned with the preparation of substances and mixtures to be used in medicine and in the arts, I have decided to insert it:

Den Nederlandtsche Slevtel van t'Secreet der Philosophie, in welck grondelijc bewesen wert, d'aert, so in't generael, als in't bysonder aller Metallen, als Goudt, Silver, Coper, etc. En dis gheheele Alchijmie, met haer verborghendtheden. Midtsgaders d'eerste materie der Philosophen, Dat is: Quinta essentia des Wijns, met haren volcomen ghebruyck, en verclaringhe aller duystere woorden des voorsz. Consten, op dat Paracelsus claerlijck in alles mach werden verstaen. Door Hermannvs Follinvs, der vrije Consten, ende der Medecijne Doctor, [Vignette of two furnaces.]

Ghedruckt t'Haerlem, by Adriaen Rooman, voor Daniel de Keyser, Boeckvercooper, woonende op't Sant, in't vergulden A. B. C. Anno 1613.

Small 8vo. A to I in eights, K four, or ff. 76. Black letter.

Woodcuts in the text.

Follinus was the author of a few other tracts.*

---

* For notices of Follinus and lists of his works, consult: Mercklin, *Lindenius Renovatus*, Norimbergæ, 1686, p. 408; Joh. Franc. Foppens, *Bibliotheca Belgica*, Bruxellis, 1739, I., p. 474; Christian Wilh. Kestner, *Medicinisches Gelahrten-Lexicon*, Jena, 1740, p. 303; *Biographie Médicale*, Paris, Panckoucke, n.d., IV., p. 177 (a depreciatory notice); *Biographie Nationale publiée par l'Académie Royale . . . de Belgique*,

69. Those who are interested in the deterioration of books, due to repeated publication, as illustrated by the *Dificio de Ricette* already noticed (§ 13), will find another example to their hand in the work of Etienne Binet.

Under the name of René François he produced a book called *Essay des Merveilles de Nature, et des plus nobles Artifices*, which is said to have appeared at Rouen in 1621, in 4to. The second edition is in the British Museum (835, h. 6), with the imprint: Rouen, Jean Osmont, 1622. It forms a respectable 4to, widely and legibly printed on fairly good paper, and it is decorated with an elaborate engraved title by J. Briot, and with passable woodcut illustrations. Altogether for a Rouen book of that date one might call it handsome. It contains pp. [2] [14] 592 [1, 1 blank].

In the Museum there is nothing between the second edition and the ninth (12202, aaa. 6). This is another Rouen edition, Charles Osmont, 1644. It is a closely packed octavo, with no engraved title, on poor soft spongy paper. It was no longer a book to be made look well, but it had to be turned out in as cheap and shabby a condition as possible, and Osmont has been quite successful in his effort. It contains pp. [16] 630 [2].

The copy that I have myself procured introduces a puzzle which, without having more editions, I cannot undertake to solve. It is of the tenth edition and was printed at Lyons by Nicholas Gay, in 1643, in small 8vo, pp. [16] 607 [1 blank]. Various explanations of this anomaly in the dates of the ninth and tenth editions may be suggested, but without more evidence they would be futile. This is a wretched production, on dingy porous paper, with a few miserably executed illustrations.

The thirteenth edition, Paris, chez Henry Le Gras, 1657, in 8vo, is in the Museum (58, b. 6). The printing, though very close, is legible, and the margins are ampler, so that on the whole this edition looks somewhat better than the preceding. It contains pp. [16] 607 [1 blank].

The collection is rather unusual; the themes of the different sections have very little to do with each other. Still the book is not without its

---

Bruxelles, 1880-1883, VII., col. 181; August Hirsch, *Biographisches Lexikon der hervorragenden Aerzte*, Wien und Leipzig, 1885, II., p. 398. The *Sleutel* is not mentioned by these authorities, which, perhaps, is another reason for including it here.

merits, and gives curious information on some out-of-the-way topics. The "most noble artifices" practically include the arts, as gardening, printing, painting, sculpture, dyeing, architecture, heraldry, music, etc. The aim of all this instruction, however, is not to enable the reader to understand or to practise any of the arts, but to talk about them! The author says so. It was meant for the fine gentleman of the time, who wished to be able to converse on any topic with an appearance of consummate skill and learning, though he may have had no practical knowledge whatever.

70. The author was born at Dijon, 1569, and died at Paris, 4th July, 1639. He joined the Jesuits in 1590, and became rector of the chief houses of the order in France. He wrote and published a great deal, but one critic says that he had more zeal and piety than talent, and that of his numerous publications only two or three are worth remembering, of which the *Essay des Merveilles*, now under consideration, is one. It went through twenty editions in a hundred years, and another writer says, this "work is not read now-a-days, and it does not deserve such neglect."* He called himself René Francois, in allusion to his name Binet, bis natus!

A long list of his works is given by Backer,† amongst which occurs the present *Essay*. The editions quoted are these:

Rouen, Osmont, 1621, 4to. Apparently the first edition.
Rouen, Osmont, 1622, 4to. The printed title calls this the fifth edition.
Rouen, Osmont, 1625.
Rouen, Osmont, 1626, 4°. The sixth edition.
Rouen, Osmont, 1629, 4°. The seventh edition.
Paris, 1646, 8°.
Rouen, Osmont, 1648, 8°. The ninth edition.
Rouen, Viret, 1657, 8°. The tenth edition.

But the editions I have seen and described above furnish forth a second list:

Rouen, Jean Osmont, 1622, 4to. The second edition.
Rouen, Charles Osmont, 1644, 8°. The ninth edition.
Lyons, N. Gay, 1643, 8°. The tenth edition.
Paris, Le Gras, 1657, 8°. The thirteenth edition.

---

* *Biographie Universelle*, Paris, 1843, IV., 347, article by Weiss.

† *Bibliothèque des Écrivains de la compagnie de Jésus*, par Augustin et Alois de Backer, Liége, 1853. Première Série, p. 95, No. 7. Here only the edition of 1621 is mentioned. The subsequent list is given in the Septième Série, Liége, 1861, p. 108, No. 8.

It is hard enough to reconcile the dates 1644 and 1643 of the ninth and tenth editions, but who will arrange the chaos of dates and editions of the first list and the second? Is all this disorder an outcome of the author's Order?

71. On pyrotechny, in the modern sense of the term, there is a treatise that ought certainly to be included in an enumeration of old books on practical arts and applied science.

La Pyrotechnie de Hanzelet Lorrain ou font reprefentez les plus rare & plus appreuuez fecrets des machines & des feux artificiels, Propres pour affieger battre furprendre & deffendre toutes places.

Av Pont a Movsson par I. & Gafpard Bernard. 1630.

4to. Signatures: *A*, A to Z, Aa to Kk in fours. Pagination: [8] 264.

This book has an engraved title-page, and is enriched by a large number of engravings, of which the firework ship is the most elaborate.

The book is occupied mainly with fireworks of all kinds for war, including artillery, especially for siege purposes, and a portion of the work really deals with siege operations. Only a small part at the end is devoted to fireworks for amusement. It may be compared with the works of Bate, White, and Jones.

The author, Jean Appier Hanzelet, as he signs his name at the end of the dedication, was the son of an engineer who was in charge of the fortifying of Nancy. He was born in Lorraine in the sixteenth century, and was a printer and engraver. In 1620, at Pont-à-Mousson, he published, in 4to, a treatise on military machines and fireworks for war and pleasure, with one hundred plates executed by the author. The *Pyrotechnie* is an entirely new work. The plates are bold and instructive, and were presumably by the author.

The copy of the book which I have bears the book plate of "William Penn Esqr. Proprietor of Pensylvania. 1703."

72. In my "Notes" (Part VI., p. 11) an account was given of the English translation by Rowlands, London, 1657, of the notable work on natural history by Joannes Jonstonus. The first edition, in Latin, appeared at Amsterdam in 1632. I have not seen it, but I have got a copy of the next edition, the title of which runs thus:

Iohannis Ionstoni | Thavmatographia | Natvralis, | In Claffes decem divifa: | in quibus | Admiranda | Coeli, | Elementorvm, | Meteororvm, | Foffilivm, | Plantarvm, |

Avivm, | Qvadrvpedvm, | Exangvivm, | Piscivm, | Hominis. | Editio Secunda priore auctior. | [Device of acorns and fleurs-de-lys.]
Amstelodami, | Apud Ioannem Ianssonivm. | Anno M. DC. XXXIII. |
24mo. Signatures: (?) in two, A to Z, Aa in twelves, Bb 2; or pp. [6] 578 [2].

This volume ranges with the Elzevirs. This copy has no frontispiece or engraved title, if the book was issued originally with such a decoration.

73. More than once have the works of Domenico Auda been cited.* Here is another edition:

Breve Compendio | Di Maravigliosi | Secreti | Approuati con felice ſucceſſo nelle | indiſpoſitioni corporali. | Diviso in Qvattro Libri. |
Nel I. Si tratta di Secreti medicinali.
Nel II. Di Secreti appartenenti a diuerſe coſe.
Nel III. Di Secreti Chimici di varie Sorti.
Nel IV. D'Aſtrologia Medicinale.
Con vn trattato per conſeruarſi in ſanità | Dato in Lvce Dal Signor | Fr. Domenico Avda | Capo Speciale nell' Archihoſpedale | di S. Spirito in Roma. | Con nuoua Aggiunta dell' iſteſſo Autore. | Dedicato | Al Molt' Illuſtre Sig. Pron Col. il Sig. | Fabritio | Lavro. |
In Milano, | Per Federico Franceſco Maietta. | Stampatore al Bottonuto in P. R. Ad inſtanza di Carlo Gioſeppe Quinti.
24mo. ✠, A to N in twelves; or pp. [24] 304.

The introduction is signed by Gioseppe Quinti, and is dated Milano, li 23 Decembre, 1682.

74. Auda was a native of Lantosca, in the county of Nice, cultivated botany with success, and travelled much. He settled in Rome and practised pharmacy in the monastery of the "Minimi Osservanti" of St. Francis, to which religious order he belonged. The *Breve Compendio* was published at Rome in 1655, 1660; Venice, 1663, 1676, 1692, 1716; Turin, 1665; Cuneo, 1666; Milan, 1666.† Of this book editions of Rome, 1663;‡ Torino, 1665;‡ Venice, 1673;‡ Bologna, 1673;‡ Venice, 1676‡ and 1692,§ have been already mentioned. The *Practica de' Spesiali*, his other

* Part IV., p. 322. Supplement I., *Transactions of the Archæological Society of Glasgow*, 1894, II., p. 399.

† G. G. Bonino, *Biografia Medica Piemontese*, Torino, 1824, 8vo, Vol. I., p. 396.

‡ Supplement I., *Transactions of the Archæological Society of Glasgow*, 1894, II., pp. 398, 399.

§ Part IV., p. 322.

book, came out at Cuneo, 1666; Venice, 1683; with a tract *delle confettioni nostrane*, and a *nuova aggiunta de segreti*. The edition of this work which has been included in these Notes is dated Venice, 1674.*

75. The introduction throws light upon what I have pointed out before is obscure, namely, the relation of Auda to Quinti. In 1711 there was printed at Venice, and sold at Liege, a French work by Quinti which is simply a translation of Auda's *Secreti*.† Subsequently‡ I described an Italian edition of the same places and date, also with Quinti's name attached to it. The explanation of this now presents no great difficulty. In the Milan edition, say of 1682, Quinti appears as the patron and editor. His address to an unnamed "Molt' Illustre Sig." begins: "Li secreti Medicinali dell' Auda, ancorche repplicati in moltissime copie uscissero dalle Stampe di Venetia, tutta via tanta stima, e prezzo si guadagnorno, che al desiderio comune sono riuscite pochissime . . . ." If this be compared with the corresponding introduction to the edition of 1711, it will be seen how the processes of absorption have resulted in the practical assimilation of the *Compendio* by Quinti: "Ces secrets de medecine que je fair paroître au jour, ont été si bien reçûs du Public," etc., etc.§ Auda presumably was dead by this time, and there may have been nobody to challenge Quinti's taking possession of the book and getting the credit of being the author. To display the evolution of the process would require a fuller set of the intermediate editions than I have at command, but in light of the result it cannot differ from what is technically called by the wise—"conveying."

76. Under the following title there appeared a volume of secrets:

Novveaux | Secrets | Rares & Cvrievx. | Donnés Charitablement au public | par vne perſonne de | Condition. | Contenant | Divers Remedes Eprovvez, | vtils & profitables pour toutes ſortes | de Maladies. | Et diuers Secrets pour la conſeruation de | la Beauté des Dames: Auec vne nou- | uelle maniere pour faire toutes ſortes | de confitures, tant ſeiches que liquides. |

A Paris, | Chez Iean Baptiste Loyson, | ruë Sainct Iacques prés la Poſte, | à la Croix Royalle. | M. DC. LX. | Avec Privilege Dv Roy. |

Small 8vo. Signatures: ã 8, ẽ 2, A to R in eights, S in four. ã to ẽ are not paged, but A–S are paged [1-2] 3-280.

---

* Supplement I., p. 400.
† Part IV., p. 323.
‡ Supplement I., p. 400.
§ Supplement I., p. 400.

ã and ẽ contain the title; the dedication to Mons. de Siffredy, which has no date, but is signed P. Erresalde; the bookseller to the reader; the table of contents; an extract from the privilege, dated 24 November 1659 and signed Dv Bisson, and a sonnet on the merits of the book by Du Pelletier. Then comes the text, preceded by a bastard title.

This, the first edition, which is in the British Museum (1038, c. 19), is well printed in large type on an uncrowded page with nice wide margins, and is a much more attractive book than the second edition.

77. Of this also there is a copy in the Museum (1038, c. 20), but I have one here which will show its chap-book character. The following is an account of it:

Novveavx | Secrets | Rares et Cvrievx. | Donnez charitablement au public | par vne perſonne de Condition. | Contenant | Divers Remedes Eprovvez, | vtils & profitables pour toutes ſortes | de Maladies. | Seconde Edition. | Augmentée de Remedes tres-ſouuerains | pour ſe penſer de la Maladie contagieuſe, | & ſe preſeruer d'icelle. | Auec diuers Secrets pour la conſeruation de | la Beauté des Dames, & vne nouuelle | maniere pour faire toutes ſortes de confitures, | tant ſeiches que liquides. |

A Paris, | Chez Iean Baptiste Loyson, au cinquiéme Pillier | de la grand' Salle du Palais, à la Croix d'Or. | M. DC. LXIX. | Avec Privilege Dv Roy. |

12°. ã in twelves. A to K in twelves, or pp. [24] [1-2] 3-240.

ã; Title. ãij epistle to M. de Siffredy, signed P. Erresalde. ãiiij *verso*, the publisher to the reader. ãv *recto*, Table of contents, ends ãxj *recto*. ãxj *verso*, Extract from the privilege, dated 24 November 1659 and signed Dv Bisson. ãxij *recto*, Sonnet on the book by Du Pelletier, but not signed in this second edition. Aj bastard title. Text, Aij-Kxij *verso*, pp. 3-240.

As is apparent from the bulk of the two editions respectively, the second is more closely printed, and is thereby made to contain more. The contents of the first edition, ending with "Pour la migraine," occupy only 225 pages; the remaining 15 contain receipts about the plague, which are not in the other.

This collection is not arranged on any definite plan. The first section contains remedies for all sorts of ailments, the second contains "Secrets to satisfy the curious," consisting mainly of receipts for beautifying the face, followed by a number of similar receipts, and for making "waters" from certain plants. The last section contains directions for making preserves of various kinds of fruits.

A peculiarity of the arrangement of this book is that the table of contents gives one order and the book itself contains the receipts in a different order. This makes it somewhat confusing.

78. So far as the title page goes, the book is anonymous, and the only indication of the author is the name, P. Erresalde, at the end of the dedication. Not satisfied that this was not a pseudonym I consulted a few authorities, but could not find mention of any such name. In the Museum Catalogue the book is entered under that heading without any question or cross reference. It seemed, however, to me as soon as I saw it, that it was not a real name, but an anagram or transposition, and that it might stand for De la Serre. In confirmation of this view I have found no one called Erresalde, which somehow does not impress one as genuinely French, but there is an author, Jean Puget De la Serre, who lived at the end of the seventeenth century, and was a voluminous miscellaneous writer.

This treatise (like others) is not mentioned along with his principal works, but there is nothing in the theme to prevent him having been the author. At present I am disposed to ascribe the work to him.

79. During the whole course of my investigations into this literature I have not come across any book more curious, less known, and scarcer, than one which was written by George Horn. His name has been familiar to me for years as the editor of the works of Geber, but until the present little volume came into my hands I had not thought of him as an author.*

GeorgI HornI | Arca Mosis | Sive | Historia Mundi. | Quæ complectitur | Primordia Rerum Natura- | lium omniumque artium | ac ſcientiarum. | [Device.]
Lugd. Bat. & Roterod. | Ex Officina Hackiana, | A°. cIↃIↃCLXVIII. |
18mo. Sigs. *12, **6 (of which the sixth is blank), A to K in twelves, pagination [36] 220 [20]. The device is a flying eagle having a ribbon in its beak with the word *movendo*. *1 is an engraved title representing the finding of Moses. There are four female figures, two on each side of the Nile, which at this point is barely eighteen inches wide. To impart verisimilitude to the scene a crocodile about a couple of feet long is having a quiet stroll along the bank, regardless of the "invention" of Moses, which is just taking place. The background is occupied by the dense leafage of a luxuriant forest.

* He was the author also of a work on the history of philosophy: *Historiæ Philosophicæ Libri Septem*, Lugd. Bat. 1655, small 4to. As was to be expected from the author's proclivities it contains notices of alchemy.

Then come the printed title, Horn's dedication to Maurice of Beverward, dated: Lugd. Bat. 15 Aug. 1668; the preface, and a discourse on the first chapter of Genesis upon which this work is erected. The text goes from A to K2, and K3 to K12 contains an alphabetical index.

So far as I have observed, there is no copy in the British Museum either of this book or of another called *Arca Noæ*, 1666, 1674, which Graesse mentions, but which I regret I have not seen.

80. This is a book for which it is very difficult to find a place. It is on the secrets of creation, and includes a survey of natural history, and of the arts and sciences. The material which it embraces if properly expanded and elucidated would fill a volume a hundred times the size and more, in fact does fill the *Speculum Naturale*, *Morale* and *Doctrinale* of Vincent de Beauvais. The way in which Horn has managed to pack so much into such trifling space is by confining himself to names and the very briefest of definitions. Indeed the book is more a collection of notes to be elaborated than a treatise upon the subjects embraced. Beginning with the creation and general notions of space, form, and substance, he discourses on the elements and ultimate parts of matter, and on the great variety of their products and functions both in animate and inanimate nature. He, too, recognizes the sympathy and antipathy which apparently pervade the different parts of nature, and under the influence of that idea deals with disease.

Of the arts and sciences the only one which gets any attention is (as might be expected from the editor of Geber) chemistry, and to it is devoted a large proportion of the whole book, pp. 176-220, or exactly one-fifth.

For those who are interested in the history of that science, this is a valuable section, for in it Horn describes the apparatus, the operations, and the products, and thus gives an excellent *résumé* of the theoretical chemistry of the middle of the seventeenth century.

Altogether the *Arca Mosis* is one of the most original books which I have met with. If the *Arca Noæ* be as curious, it must be a desirable little volume.

81. The Secrets which passed under the name of Sir Kenelm Digby enjoyed some popularity at home, but were in still greater esteem on the

Continent. They appeared in Dutch, French, and German, and several editions have been quoted already, but the number is not exhausted.

I mentioned formerly* an edition of the *Remedes Souverains*, printed at Paris in 1684. As the privilege is dated 1668, there may have been several issues of the book prior to it; but there is nothing on the title-page of that edition suggestive of an earlier one. It might have been the first. The licence also bears that the book was translated from the Latin and English, but I have not seen the original collections.

Another edition, similar to this, appeared in 1689:

Remedes Souverains et Secrets Experimentez, De M. Le Chevalier Digby, Chancelier de la Reine d'Angleterre. Avec plusieurs autres Secrets & parfums curieux pour la conservation de la beauté des Dames. Nouvelle Edition.

A Paris, Chez Guillaume Cavelier, au quatriéme Pillier de la grande Salle du Palais, à la Palme. M.DC.LXXXIX. Avec Privilege Dv Roy.

Small 12mo. ã in two, A to Z, Aa to Dd in alternate eights and fours; or pp. [4] 300 [28].

82. Another book, in its sixth edition, containing the preceding along with other tracts, dated 1700, was referred to at the same time.† I have got another edition of it also, called the seventh:

Nouveaux Secrets Experimentez, Pour conserver la Beauté des Dames, Et pour guérir plusieurs sortes de Maladies. Tirez des Mémoires de M. le Chevalier Digby, . . . Avec son Discours touchant la guérison des Plaies, par la Poudre de Sympathie. . . . Septiéme Edition, revûë, corrigée & augmentée d'un Volume.

A La Haye, Et se vend A Bruxelles, Chez Jean van Vlaenderen, vis à vis l'Eglise de S. Jean. M.DCC.XV.

Small 8vo. Tome I.: 4 pp.; *, **, in fours; A to M in eights; or pp. [20 including the frontispiece] 192. Tome II.: 4 pp.; * in four; A to I in eights; K in six; or pp. [12] 156.

The *Remedes Souverains* occupy pp. 1–172, and the *Secrets pour conserver la Beauté des Dames*, pp. 185–192 of the first volume of this edition. The second volume contains the discourse on the powder of sympathy, and a number of receipts from various authors.

83. Of the Dutch translation I have two editions to describe. The book first came out in 1681,‡ and then it was revised and issued again.

* Part VI., p. 19. † *Ibid.*, p. 19.
‡ Prefatory Note to the Second Edition, by the Publishers.

Theatrum Sympateticum, ofte Wonder-Toneel der Natuurs Verborgentheden Behelfende Een uitftekende Oratie, over het gebruik des Poeders de Sympathie, . . . door Kenelmus Digby, . . . Benevens Twee waardige Vervolgen, van veele zeldzame Antipathien en Sympathien . . . met meer andere Geheimeniffen der Natuurkunde, Door N. Papinius, en A. Kircherus. Den Tweeden Druk, vermeerdert en verbeetert.

Te Leeuwarden, by Hendrik Rintjes, en t'Amfterdam, by Jan ten Hoorn, Boekverkoopers. M DC XCVII.

Small 8vo. * in four; A to U, Aa to Oo, in eights; or pp. [8, including the engraved title] 320; 196 (misprinted 169) [20].

The fourth edition is a reprint of this, and was published at Amsterdam by Nicolaas Ten Hoorn, in 1727. It is in 8vo; * in six; A to Z, Aa to Kk, Nn, in eights; Oo in four; or pp. [12, including the engraved title], 528 [24]. The signatures and pagination are continuous. This translation contains the following tracts:

Digby's Discourse on the powder of Sympathy.
Laurens Strauss's remarks thereon.
An account of the divining rod.
Papin and Rattray on Sympathy and Antipathy.
Kircher on Magnetic influences in Nature.

A translation of the *Remedes Souverains* mentioned above forms the second division of the Dutch book. I do not know if other editions of any of the preceding collections were subsequently published.

84. The following curious little book has, at least, the merit of novelty, and treats of a topic which seems to have very little literature devoted to it:

Ecole De La Mignatvre, Dans Laquelle On peut aifément apprendre à Peindre fans Maître. Avec Le Secret De faire les plus belles Couleurs, l'Or Bruny, & l'Or en Coquille.

Se vend à Paris, Chez Christophe Ballard, feul Imprimeur du Roy pour la Mufique, ruë S. Jean de Beauvais, au Mont Parnaffe. M.DC.LXXIII. Avec Privilege du Roy.

Small 8vo. ã, ẽ, A to S, in fours; or pp. [16] 134 [Table, 10].

The dedication to Mlle. Fovcqvet is signed C. B., and is couched in the phraseology of the time, compounded about equally of inordinate flattery, vanity and humility.

The book is different from any which have hitherto found a place in these notes. It is an exposition of the art of miniature-painting, in which the way of drawing the picture, the preparation of the vellum, the colours and the mixtures of them, and the manner of laying them on, are described. The latter part is devoted to the painting of the skin, of the hair, of ornaments of gold, silver, and precious stones, of fire and smoke, of landscapes, and, lastly, of flowers. At the end is the method of preparing ultramarine, carmine, green, and gold.

85. One must suppose that the art of painting in miniature was a popular one, for the book passed through a number of editions, as the list following will demonstrate:

1672. Traité de la mignature.
Barbier.* This is seemingly the first edition.

1673. Ecole de la Mignature. Paris, Christophe Ballard. 8°.
Copy described above.

1674. Traité de la mignature.
Barbier. In a note it is said: "Les premières éditions, qui portent le titre de: 'Traité de la mignature,' furent imprimées en 1672 et 1674." The author did not know that the 1673 edition was already called *École*; always presuming that the respective treatises are identical, which I have not yet ascertained.

1679. École (l') de la mignature, dans laquelle on peut apprendre aisément à peindre sans maître, avec le secret de faire les plus belles couleurs, l'or bruni et l'or en coquilles. Nouvelle édition augmentée.
Lyon, François Duchesne, 1679, in 12, XII. 164 pp. et 1 f. de priv.
Barbier.

1684. Traité de Mignature, pour apprendre aisément à peindre sans maître, *etc.* [With a dedication subscribed C. B., *i.e.* Christophe Ballard.] Paris, 1684. 12°.
Under "B. C." in the British Museum Catalogue, 1043, d. 8.

1688. — Dernière édition, *etc.* [With a dedication subscribed C. B., *i.e.* Christophe Ballard.] La Haye, 1688. 12°.
Under "B.C." in the B. M. Catalogue, 1043, a. 13.

1696. — Troisiesme édition . . . augmentée. Paris, C. Ballard. 1696. 8°.
Under "B.C." B. M. Catalogue, 787, c. 24. Barbier, under the heading "École."

1697. — 4e éd. Paris, C. Ballard, 1697, in 12.
Barbier, under "École."

1708. Traité de la peinture en mignature pour apprendre aisément à peindre sans maître. Ouvrage corrigé et augmenté . . . auquel on a ajouté un . . . traité

---

* *Dictionnaire des Ouvrages Anonymes* par Ant. Alex. Barbier. Troisième édition revue . . . par Olivier Barbier, René et Paul Billard. Paris, 1874. Tome II., col. 15.

de la peinture au pastel, . . . la maniere de laver . . . toutes sortes de plans, le secret de faire le plus belles couleurs . . . avec une explication . . . de tous les termes propres au dessein et à la peinture. / La Haye, 1708. 12°.
Under "Traité," B. M. Catalogue, 1043, d. 17.

1711. Traité de mignature. Nouvelle édition. Paris, 1711. 8°.
Under "B.C." B. M. Catalogue, 1853, a. 37 (2).

1724. École (l') de la mignature. Rouen, P. Dumesnil, 1724, in 12.
Barbier.

1759. — Bruxelles, J. Moris, 1759, in 12.
Barbier.

1769. — Paris, J. B. G. Musier, 1769, in 12.
Barbier. B. M. Catalogue, 7857, aa. 36, under "École."

1782. — Paris, Musier, 1782, in 12.
Barbier.

1802. — Paris, Moutardier, an XI., 1802, in 12.
Barbier. B. M. Catalogue, 7855, aa. 17, under "École."

1817. — Paris, Bachelier, 1817, in 12.
Barbier.

There are altogether sixteen editions in this list, but it is probable there are others. Barbier enumerates eleven; there are seven in the British Museum, of which three only are mentioned by Barbier, whereas eight in his list are not in the Museum. My own copy, 1673, picked up on the Quai at Paris, is neither in the Museum nor in Barbier.

86. From the preceding *résumé* it appears that the book was published with two different titles: *Traité* and *École*. As I have already said, I have not yet been able to settle by actual comparison whether the two treatises are otherwise identical or not; but from the way they are arranged in both Barbier's and the Museum lists I presume they are so.*

With regard to the author whose initials C. B. are at the end of the dedication, he was apparently at one time supposed to be Claude Boutet, and in my copy there is a manuscript note affirming this.

Barbier,† however, subsequently attributed the work to Christopher Ballard, the publisher, founding on a note by L. T. Hérissant. He says:

> L'auteur, à la fin d'un épître à Mademoiselle Fouquet, s'est désigné par les lettres C. B. qu'on retrouve encore dans l'extrait du privilége, qui termine ce volume.

---

* See note at the end of this paper.

† *Dictionnaire des Ouvrages Anonymes et Pseudonymes.* Seconde édition. Paris, 1822. I., p. 355.

Le privilége entier, qui est dans l'édition de 1672, où se trouve déjà l'épître dédicatoire à Mademoiselle Fouquet, signée également C. B., porte en toutes lettres *Christophe Ballard*, et semble indiquer le vrai rédacteur de cet écrit, qui sans doute n'avait pas avoué ce travail, parce qu'il n'était qu'amateur dans la peinture. Il avait été réçu libraire-imprimeur en 1666.

The inference is plausible, but it is not conclusive. In my copy only an extract of the privilege is given, and only the initials C. B. appear, so that the full name was dropped immediately.

87. In the Museum Catalogue, as a consequence presumably of the cataloguing rules, the work appears under four headings. Thus under "École" are placed the editions of 1769 and 1802, and the author's name is given inaccurately as C. *Bullard*. This, of course, is useless as a cross reference, for this name does not appear in the Catalogue, and but for Barbier one could not have known that the correct form was *Ballard*, which *is* contained in the Museum Catalogue. Under this heading, again, there is another cross reference to "B. C." under which are placed the editions of 1684, 1688, 1696, and 1711. Finally, and without any cross reference at all, on looking under "Traité" in the Catalogue, one finds the edition published at the Hague in 1708. The result is that I am not certain that I have yet ascertained all the editions of this little treatise which are in the Museum.

88. Notwithstanding its title, the following is a general collection:

Recueil des plus beaux Secrets de Medecine, Pour la Guerison de toutes les maladies, bleſſures, & autres accidens qui ſurviennent au Corps humain; Et la maniere de preparer facilement dans les Familles les remédes & médicamens qui y ſont néceſſaires.

Comme auſſi pluſieurs Secrets curieux ſur d'admirables effets de la Nature & de l'Art.

Avec un Traité des plus excellens Preſervatifs contre la Peſte, Fiévres peſtilentielles, Pourpre, petite Verole, & toutes ſortes de maladies contagieuſes.

Le tout experimenté, recueilli, & donné au Public par une perſonne trés-habile & charitable. Divisé en Deux Parties.

A Paris, Chez Thomas Guillain, M. DC. XCV.

12mo. Signatures: A to S in twelves; or pp. [1-6] 7-406 [23, 1 blank].

A12 is an etching of an oriental physician (?) examining drugs brought to him by four attendants in oriental costume. Although included in the signature A, it is dropped in the pagination. The title is in red and black. The first six

pages are occupied with title and note to the reader. Then the text, and the last 23 pages contain the Tables.

The first part is devoted to secrets of medicine (7-258).

The second part begins with secrets for beautifying the body—scents, etc. Then follow secrets about minerals, colours, ink; secrets of gardening and a number of miscellaneous secrets of medecine, magic, and so on.

It is rather an interesting collection. The author is said to be Michel Mourgues. [B. M. 1038, c. 28.]

89. A collection of secrets in B. M. 777, g. 11, is entirely new to me. It is not a translation of the preceding.

Thesaurus Secretorum Curiosorum In Quo Curiosa Non Solum Ad Omnes Corporis Humani cùm internos, tùm externos Morbos curandos, ſed etiam ad Cutis, Faciei, aliarumque Partium ornatum, formam, nitorem, & elegantiam conciliandos continentur Secreta. Quibus Insuper Quamplurima Varii Generis non minùs Curioſa, qùam utilia addita ſunt Secreta. Cum Indice Partium, Capitum, & Materiarum quæ in toto Opere continentur.

Coloniæ Allobrogum Sumptibus Societatis. M. DCC IX.

4to. Signatures: §, §§, A-Z, Aa-Zz, Aaa-Zzz, Aaaa-Bbbb, in fours; or pp. [15, 1 blank] 668. Title red and black.

This is a great collection of medical prescriptions for all sorts of diseases, divided into twenty parts. Then part 21 contains secrets for beautifying the skin; and part 22 contains 13 chapters: 1 of secrets of the fire, 2 of water, 3 of the mind, 4 of food and drink, 5 of love, 6 of animals, 7 of fishes, 8 of birds and insects, 9 of metals, 10 of glass and gems, 11 of clothes, 12 of writing, 13 of painting and colours.

Some of these are taken from the *Secreet-Boeck*, and from Albertus Magnus, etc. They furnish an additional illustration of the persistence of these old notions, and also how books are compiled. The author conceals his name, and he gives no authorities.

A copy which I have procured coincides with the above, but the index, which in the Museum copy is at the end, is here placed at the beginning in the order of the signatures.

90. Disappointed once or twice in my attempts to get the following, I must take my description from the Museum copy (7953, a. 59).

Le | Parfumeur | François, | Qui Enseigne | Toutes les maniéres de tirer | Les Odeurs Des Fleurs; | & de faire toutes ſortes de | compoſitions de Parfums. | Avec le

ſecret de purger | Le Tabac En Poudre; | & de le parfumer de toutes ſortes d'Odeurs. | Pour le divertiſſement | De La Noblesse, | & l'utilité des Baigneurs and Perruquiers. | Troisieme Edition | augmentée. |

A Amsterdam, | Chez Paul Marret, dans | le Beurs-ſtraat, à la Renommé. |

Small 12mo. A11, B to K in twelves; or pp. [44] 174 [12] [6]. Title, red and black. Frontispiece of a perfumer's shop, with a lady and a gentleman making purchases. This frontispiece, I presume, is the twelfth leaf of Signature A. Not dated, but marked 1700? in the Museum Catalogue.

The preliminary matter consists of an address to the reader, a list of the chief ingredients used in perfumery, with notes upon them, and a description of the principal compositions. The text (pp. 1–174) contains the mode of preparing the various perfumes, etc., arranged according to their uses. This is followed by the table of contents, and at the end (K9 to 11) is a catalogue of new publications by Marret. K12 is wanting; it was probably blank.

This edition contains a few receipts additional to those in the English translation, which will be described in the next supplement.

91. Of all the books which have been mentioned, not one could belong more strictly to the series under discussion than that which appeared under the following title:

Secrets | concernant | Les Arts | et Metiers. | A Paris, | Chez Claude Jombert, Quay des | Auguſtins, à la deſcente du Pont-Neuf, | à l'image Nôtre-Dame. | M. DCCXVI. | Avec Privilege Du Roy. |

12mo. ā8, ē4, 18, ō4, ū2, A to Z, Aa to Zz, and Aaa to Ddd in 8 and 4 alternately, Eee in 6; or pp. [52] 610 [2].

No author's name is given, but there is an address from the publisher to the reader, from which it would appear that he himself had been the compiler.

It is divided into 18 chapters, which deal respectively with the following Secrets: Etching and graving on wood or metal; metals, including transmutation, casting, mirrors; varnishes; mastic, cements, wax; glass and imitation gems and pastes; colours and painting; gilding, staining of wood, ivory, bone; making moulds for casts; inks; making, preserving, and retoning wine; vinegar; liqueurs and essences; sweetmeats, jelly, syrups, conserves; tobacco; removing spots and stains; enriching casts, sculptures, etc.; miscellaneous secrets, such as bleaching wax, making soap, fire that

is not put out by water, a stone which catches fire with water, how to make real phosphorus from urine, which method the author says has never been so fully described before.

The chapters are followed by additional receipts supplementary to some of the sections.

This is a thorough-going technical receipt book or book of Secrets, which it would be worth while comparing with some of the older collections to ascertain how much had survived and how much was quite modern.

92. Based on the preceding is an enlarged and altered edition, which is in the Museum (1042, c. 4, 5).

Secrets | Concernans | Les Arts | Et | Metiers. | Nouvelle Edition, revûë, corrigée & | confidérablement augmentée. | Tome Premier. | (View of Nancy dated 1721.)

A Nancy, | Chez Jean de la Riviere, Marchand | Libraire à la Cour de S. A. R. fur l'Efpla- | nade, au Tems perdu. |

12mo. Tome I. 2 leaves; ā8, b4, c8, d4, A to Z, Aa to Xx in eights and fours alternately, Yy in four, Zz in 2; or pp. [4, 48] 540. In front of the text are two engraved plates in compartments representing the different arts and crafts dated 1721. At the end of the preface and also at the end of the book the little picture of Nancy is repeated and then the imprint:

A Nancy, De l'Imprimerie de Pierre | Antoine, proche l'Hôtel de Ville.

Tome II. 2 leaves. ā in twelve; A to Z, Aa to Tt in eights and fours alternately, Vu in six; or pp. [4, 24] 516. A third engraving prefixed to the text. The title pages are in black and red.

Jean de la Riviere himself seems to have been the compiler of this collection.

On the title page of Tome second the work is said to be: Divisez en IV. Parties, and instead of Nancy there is the publisher's device, a right hand out of a cloud holding a sceptre surmounted by an eye; two branches of olive (?); and a serpent biting its tail, with: Jean. | De La | Riviere | 1721 | inside.

The first volume of this work appeared in English with the title "Valuable Secrets in Arts and Trades," to which I shall refer when I come to English books.

The second volume is a treatise on dyeing, and deals with the subject under four heads: 1. Generalities, with a vocabulary of terms; 2 and 3.

The making of colours and other requisites, and dyeing; 4. Dyeing of leather. This is an important book for the history of this subject.

93. With a title similar to the preceding, there followed long after what may by courtesy be called a new edition. Whether any others appeared in the seventy years' interval I do not know, but it is creditable to the time that it was not a hard and fast reprint, like some which were produced about that period. The copy I have seen is in the British Museum (63, i. 3-6).

Secrets | Concernant | Les Arts Et Métiers; | Ouvrage utile, non ſeulement aux Artiſtes, | mais encore à ceux qui les emploient; | nouvelle Edition, conſidérablement | augmentée. | Par une Société d'Artiſtes. | Tome Premier. [Troisieme.]| [Vignette of a small landscape with a castle.]

A Paris, | Chez Bossange & Compagnie, Libraires | & Commiſſionnaires, rue des Noyers, | N°. 33. | 1791. |

12mo. I. 1 leaf. A to Z, Aa to K in twelves, L11, L12 probably blank, wanting; or pp. [2] 814.

II. 1 leaf. A to Z, Aa to Nn in twelves, Oo in six, or pp. [2] 876.

III. 1 leaf. A to Z, Aa to Ii in twelves, Kk in eight, or pp. [2] 784.

IV. 1 leaf. A to Z, Aa, in twelves, or pp. [2] 576.

Vols. I. and III. have the title as above. [III. has a flower for the vignette.]

In Vols. II. and IV. the title is as follows:

Secrets | Concernant | Les Arts Et Métiers. | Onvrage (*sic* in II. corrected in IV.) utile, non-ſeulement aux Artiſtes, | mais encore à ceux qui les emploient. | Tome Second. [Quatrieme.]|

A Paris, | Chez Moutard, Imprimeur-Libraire | de la Reine, hôtel de Cluny, rue des | Mathurins. | 1790. |

This is a much more elaborate work than that of Nancy, 1721, and although it is based upon the first volume to a small extent, it is so much enlarged and altered that it must be considered a different book altogether. The second volume of the older edition about dyeing is omitted, and entirely new chapters are introduced about metals, enamels, and other technical subjects.

94. According to the date there was published at Frankfurt in 1719 a volume entitled:

Jo. Nicol. Martii, Med. Doctor und Practici zu Braunſchweig, Unterricht von der wunderbaren Magie und derselben medicinischen Gebrauch; auch von zauber-

ischen und miraculosen Dingen: Sympathie, Spagyrik, Astrologie &c. Welchem beygefüget Ein Neu-eröffnetes Kunst-Cabinet in 178 Artikeln und Antonii Mizaldi Hundert Curieuse Kunst-Stücke. Frankfurth und Leipzig: Verlegts Christoph Gottlieb Nicolai. 1719.

The copy, however, of which the above is the title was certainly not printed in 1719, but, I should suppose, was reprinted by Scheible, 1820-30. It is a small 8vo volume containing 368 pages, of which the last 32 are occupied with very full advertisements of books on occult subjects, similar to the present. Amongst them is a reprint, parallel to this volume, of Fischer's *Albertus Magnus der Andere*, to which reference is made in this paper under the year 1790, and Tenzel's *Medicina Diastatica*, a Paracelsian book of which I have given a notice elsewhere.*

In the present volume there is some interesting matter, both practical and impracticable. The *Kunst-Cabinet* gives a number of baking and cooking receipts, drinks, wines, cosmetics and washes, sympathetic powder, remedies for a number of minor disorders. Next come all sorts of miscellaneous receipts, some of the arts, some of metallurgy, and some which are of the occult and useless kind. The author of the collection calls himself a "German Philotechnist," and he does not give us his authorities. The receipts taken from Mizaldus are much less practical, and the reasons alleged are sometimes of the quaintest and most superstitious description.

The most valuable part of the book is the first division, which is a dissertation, partly historical, partly critical, or at least descriptive, on the nature of Magic, and especially on the magical origin and treatment of disease. It deals pretty freely with Sympathy, and contains a number of useful references to the older literature of the subject. It will be examined more minutely in my paper on the Powder of Sympathy.

95. I have so very few absolute novelties to refer to that those which belong to that category deserve extra attention. Among these is the following:

Magia | Natvralis, | Sive | Exacta Declara- | tio ſecretorum vulgi captum | ſuperantium, ex varijs au- | thoribus & experientia | petita. | Lvgdvni | M.D. XXVI. |

---

* *Bibliographia Paracelsica*, Part III., 1890, p. 26 and p. 42.

This is a tiny 24mo, size 3½ by 2 inches, containing pp. 266 [30, 4 blank], poorly printed on poor paper. I have not observed any mention of it, or seen a copy of it before. It may have quite well emanated from Lyons, as it professes, but the date is certainly wrong. For (1) if it had been printed at Lyons in that year, it would, if I may judge from other specimens of about that time,* have issued from the press in a different style; and (2), if it had been printed in that year the author or compiler could not have quoted, as he has done, from Mizaldus, Cardan, George Agricola, Lemnius, Baptista Porta, Isabelle Cortese, Alexis, Bodin; not one of whom published anything for thirty years later. The truth is, the date is either late sixteenth or early seventeenth century, and it may be simply a misprint as it stands for MDLXXVI. or for MDCXXVI.

Comparison of the little volume with the two different 16mo editions of Albertus Magnus *de Secretis*, which bear date: Lvgdvni, 1566 (see Part III., pp. 210–211), makes MDLXXVI. a probable enough date for it. But that, too, is impossible; for, among the authorities quoted, are Castor Durans whose work appeared in 1595; Quercetanus, most of whose books were published subsequent to 1600, although one or two came out in 1575 and 1576; and Julius Cæsar Baricellus, whose writings appear to be all between 1600 and 1623. Quotations from any one of these makes either MDXXVI. or even MDLXXVI. impossible as the date of the book, and I have no doubt that the true date is MDCXXVI., no matter whether MDXXVI., the date on the title-page, be an intentional or unintentional error.

There is no author's name, no printer's name, no prefatory matter of any kind, but the text begins right off with an extract from Albertus Magnus. The collection is divided into two books, for no particular reason that I can see, for there is very little attempt to arrange the paragraphs, either according to subject or any other plan whatever. The contents consist of quotations of marvellous secrets from the authors above specified, and a few from some others of earlier date, such as Dioscorides, Galen, Pliny, Vitruvius, Cato, Palladius, Albertus Magnus, Paracelsus; but the great majority are from the secret-mongers of the latter half of the

* Say the works of Symphorien Champier.

sixteenth century, with a few unsigned paragraphs, which may be original. It is difficult, however, to see what was the motive for culling these secrets in particular and printing them by themselves in this minute volume. Anyhow, it is curious for its size, its rarity, and for displaying what sort of books could find currency some 250 to 300 years ago.

96. Albertus Parvus, the Small Albert, counterpart or burlesque of Albertus Magnus, the Great Albert (if indeed he can be burlesqued), has had the book of Secrets which goes under his name alluded to more than once.* The book, as to its contents, is worse than worthless, but the fact of its numerous editions and circulation as a chap-book shows that it has been believed in to a great extent. The editions already quoted are all got up in the shabbiest style, with fictitious place and person of publication. A copy I have recently got is no exception to the squalor of the others, but the title is slightly different:

> Le Solide Tresor des Merveilleux Secrets de la Magie Naturelle et Cabalistique du Petit Albert, Traduit exactement fur l'Original Latin, . . . A Geneve, Aux Dépens de la Compagnie.

It is a small 12mo, of pp. [8] 175 [1 blank] with 5 separate plates and several woodcuts in the text. In the later editions certain of the pictures, such as of Hippomanes and Enula Campana, which were supposed to engender love, the hand of glory, and some others, have separate plates devoted to them, but as far as poverty of execution goes there is nothing to choose between them.

This so-called Geneva edition has no date, but it belongs to the end of the seventeenth or early years of last century.

The only difference between this and the editions of 1729 and 1803 is that it wants a short supplement of eight or ten leaves containing "Secrets Curieux Eprouvez trouvez dans le Cabinet d'un Curieux de la Nature," which occurs in those editions. The most interesting of these, perhaps, is the description of a magnetic table or board for communicating with a friend at a distance. Round the board are the letters of the alphabet. On a pivot in the middle a magnetic needle can be mounted

* Part IV., p. 333.

when required. The persons who wish to communicate have two exactly similar boards. The message is sent by moving one needle to successive letters, when the other needle moves correspondingly. After the communication is finished, the needles must be removed, wrapt in cotton, and carefully protected from rust. The only thing left unexplained is the cause of the simultaneous motions of the needles.

This, however, was not a new idea, for it was started before these books were printed. A similar notion will be found spoken of by Strada,* and in a tiny volume by William Cooper there is an idea of the same kind.† Something very like it too was made use of by Lord Lytton in his story called "The Haunted and the Haunters," but it is there modified to suit the exigencies of horror.

The remainder of the supplement presents nothing else of interest. It is unnecessary to refer to this queer book unless to know what kind of secrets passed under the designation of magical, and what nonsense they were, or, at least, what perverted notions they expressed.

97. In 1885‡ I referred to a collection of secrets which, under the name of *L'Albert Moderne*, was intended to be more rational and more decent than the "great and little Albert." The book was first published at Paris in 1768; again in 1769, and a reprint at Basle in 1770. Each of these was in a single volume. I have not seen the third edition, which was issued about 1782, but a little time ago I obtained a copy of the fourth edition, in three volumes.

L'Albert Moderne, Ou Nouveaux Secrets Et Procédés, Utiles Ou Curieux, Pour l'entretien de la beauté & de la ſanté; La guériſon des maux & maladies; La conſervation & les diverſes préparations des alimens & des boiſſons; Les diverſes parties de l'économie, tant civile que rurale; Les Arts & Métiers des Villes & des Campagnes. Quatrieme Édition. Augmentée de Conſeils & Avis pour apprécier, ces Secrets, & d'un 3me Volume. Tome Premier.

A Paris, Chez Duchesne Libraire, rue Saint-Jacques, No. 47. 1793.

---

* *Prolusiones Academicæ*, Oxonii, 1746, p. 232. The *Prolusiones* were first published at Rome, in 1617.

† *Aurifontina Chemica*, London, 1680, p. 65.

‡ Part IV., p. 329, *Transactions*, N.S., I., 1888.

12mo. Tome I.: pp. [4] 479 [1 blank]; Tome II.: pp. [4] 424; Tome III.: pp. 8, 468.

The title really gives a very good summary of the contents.

The first volume, arranged similarly to the first edition, contains most of it, with certain omissions and additions. The second and third volumes are also arranged under the same main divisions: the health of man; the health of domestic animals; domestic economy, including the preservation and preparation of foods; useful practical receipts. Under each division the matter is arranged alphabetically. The drawback to the work is that the matter is distributed through the three volumes, so that they have all to be consulted for information on any single point. It is difficult to see why, when the book was issued as a whole, the contents were not brought together and properly systematized. However, as the book is extinct and never likely to be consulted for practical purposes, it is futile to criticise the shortcomings of the compiler now.

98. The jumble by Eberhardt Heinrich Fischer, which he calls *Albertus Magnus der Andere und Wahre*, was reprinted some fifty or sixty years ago. The edition mentioned before was that of 1797.* The present one has the following title:

Albertus Magnus der Andere und Wahre; das ist: Geheimnisse der Natur und Kunst, auch der raresten Wunderwirkungen in Hunderten hoch nützlicher, curioser, magischer, sympathetischer &c. Vorschriften.

Altona und Leipzig | bey J. H. Kave, 1790.

16mo, pp. 352. [The last sixteen pages contain the contents of a book: *Der geheimnissvolle Tausendkünstler*, by way of an advertisement.]

The date here given may have been that of the edition from which the present one was copied, but it is certainly not that of the present book, which looks like one of Scheible's issues about the year 1820-30. Anyhow it shows that there are people who have not forgotten the book, and think it worthy of being perpetuated. The volume contains a few useful receipts, but there is much nonsense in it as well. The authorities he quotes are the standard ones upon the subject: Cardan, Mizaldus, Wecker, Porta, Alexis and others. It can easily be seen, therefore, that the result

* Part IV., p. 331.

will be a mixed one, and Fischer either had not or refused to exercise the critical faculty in selecting materials for the work on which he has conferred the august name of Albertus.

If 1790 be the date of the first edition, as seems to be the case, it gives us an insight into the state of popular practical knowledge that a book could then be compiled, not from the works of the contemporary chemists, but from the secret-mongers of two centuries earlier; and if it is still purchased, not as a curiosity but for practical purposes, it shows how much has still to be done for the propagation of sound scientific knowledge among certain sections of the population in Germany.

99. There are few arts which are more dependent upon receipts than that of dyeing, and none therefore upon which one would expect to find more books. But apparently the old dyers were as reticent about their secrets as the foreman of a modern colour house, for the earlier literature is very meagre, and I have had only one or two distinct treatises to mention,* although I have pointed out repeatedly that many of the general collections contain secrets of colours and receipts for dyeing. This scarcity makes the two following books the more important:

Neu-ausgefertigtes und mit vielen Raren Kunst-Stücken geziertes Farben-Buchlein, Oder Gründlicher Unterricht, wie man Baumwollen-wüllen und leinen Garn, dessgleichen halb wüllen und halb leinen Gewebes, oder auch ganz wüllen oder ganz leinene Waaren in allerhand schönen Farben abfärben und zurichten solle; [vignette] Allen Färbern, Parchend-Webern, Tuch- Rasch- und Zeugmachern, Meselan, Warff- und Leinwebern, wie auch vielerley Handwerkern, Hausvättern und Hausmüttern zu dienlichen Nutzen am Tag gegeben, und mit vielen neuen Kunst-Stücken Leder zu färben, auch ein und andere schändliche Flecke durch sonderbare Erfindung aus wüllen Tuch und seidnen Zeug zu bringen.

Im Jahr Christi 1748.

Small 8vo. A to H in eights, but H8 blank, is wanting. No pagination. Title red and black. The Vignette represents the interior of a dye house with the workman prosecuting his business. As the title page almost implies or suggests, this is a chap book.

A practical treatise on dyeing which is a hundred and fifty years old—in fact any genuine technical treatise of such an age—cannot fail to be of

* See § 92, *Secrets Concernans les Arts et Metiers*, 1721.

interest to any one engaged in the same art in our own day. In the present case we have the materials employed—colours, mordants, leys, and so on; the quantities to be used for a given amount of stuff to be dyed; the process, the length of time the action is to go on; the precautions necessary to obtain a really good result. Everything is carefully detailed. These were the methods followed, when, apparently, cloth and articles of clothing were dyed at home, before dye works on the large scale were started. The attraction of such a book to the scientific chemist lies in the chemical compounds which were used, and in the empiricism of the processes involving actions which are beginning only now to be understood.

100. Curiously enough another book on the same subject had come under my notice a couple of months earlier than the preceding, showing, as I have before remarked, how related books come together quite unexpectedly.

L'Art de faire les Indiennes, Et de compoſer les plus belles Couleurs, bon teint à cet uſage; de peindre les Étoffes de ſoie & en Mignature; de laver les Deſſeins, Plans, Cartes Géographiques, &c.; de teindre le Bois, la Paille, le Crin, les Fleurs artificielles, &c., avec pluſieurs ſecrets pour faire toute ſorte de Couleurs qui n'altérent point les Étoffes, & qui ſont à l'épreuve du grand air & du ſoliel. Par M. Delormois, Deſſinateur du Roi, & Coloriſte. [Vignette.]
A Paris, Chez les Libraires Associés. M. DCC. LXXX.

Small 8vo. *, A to E in eights, F in four, G in two; or pp. xvj, 84, viij.

This is a treatise on calico printing and dyeing. It describes the designing of the patterns, the method of printing, and the receipts for the colours. In the second part are given receipts for liquid colours, or, as they are called, "the secrets of the composition of the colours." This book therefore brings itself under the general category of secrets. Like the preceding it interests the calico-printer and chemist alike, but it deals with printing rather than with dyeing.

There is apparently no copy of this book in the British Museum.

101. One of the delights of a chap-book lies sometimes in the contrast between the resounding announcement of the title-page, with the puny echo of the text. Some examples have occurred in previous parts, and I shall have one or two more to produce hereafter, but the following is a typical instance:

Le Secret Des Secrets De La Nature, Extraits tant du petit Albert, que d'autres Philosophes Hébreux, Grecs, Arabes, Chaldéens, Egyptiens, et de beaucoup

d'autres Modernes. Enrichi de plusieurs rares secrets de Cornelius Agrippa, Marac Trimegiste, d'Arnosa, de Villeneuve de Cardon, d'Alexis Piémontois, et plusieurs autres. Vu et corrigé par M. Mallemans. [Vignette of a cock pecking at a bunch of grapes.]

Limoges, Chapoulaud, Imprimeur-Libraire.

12mo. A, B, in six, C in four; or pp. 32. No date, but about 1800.

The performance corresponding to this vast promise is striking. There are secrets for procuring love, for silencing a dog, for dyeing the hair, secrets about sheep, secrets for amusement (preferably at somebody else's expense) quite dull and futile, for catching birds, and taking foxes, moles, hares, rats, for killing vermin, for curing a few ailments, for etching on iron, for changing lead into tin, some sleight of hand tricks,—and that is all. The author has, unfortunately, omitted the names of the philosophers of antiquity and of modern times who could authenticate the receipts.

102. The age of "Secrets" is not yet past. Witness a work printed within the last thirty years, the title of which might have introduced a book of the sixteenth century on the same topic. [B. M. 7944, aaa. 25.]

Secrets | Des Anciens | Et | Recettes Nouvelles | Pour la Toilette, la Propreté et les Vêtements | l'Hygiène et les Aliments | les Meubles, les Appartements, les Maisons et les Jardins | la Destruction des Animaux nuisibles | *suivis de* | Remèdes et Conseils pour la Santé |

Avignon | Amédée Chaillot, Editeur | Place du Change, 5 | 1865 |

12mo. pp. 197 [1 blank].

The Toilette includes removal of wrinkles and spots, the teeth, hands, baths, the hair, almond paste, pastils, scent bags.

Preservation of clothes—washing.

Preserves of fruits, olives, eggs, wine, etc.

Cleaning articles of vertu, bronzes, armour.

Cleaning of rooms—damp, paints.

Gardens—Destruction of insects, wasps, moths, ants, of moles, or worms.

Receipts for the preservation of health.

The three supplements now ended contain the books in foreign languages which have come under my observation during the last few years, and the largest number of these are in Italian. The English books, many of which are rare and curious, will be dealt with in the next supplement.

NOTE TO §§84-87 (JUNE 24, 1898).

Since the above was printed I have examined the copies in the British Museum, and have made the following notes, which will be enough to show what connection exists between the different editions there.

1684. Traité de Mignature. . . . Troisième Edition, Reveuë, corrigée & augmentée.
A Paris, Chez Christophle Balard. . . . 1684.
Small 12mo. ã in 7, A to G in twelves; or pp. [14] 351 (a misprint for 151, but as pp. 83-88 inclusive are dropped, the true number is 146). Table [9].

1688. Traité de Mignature. . . . Derniere Edition corrigée & augmentée de plusieurs Secrets.
à la Haye, 1688.
Small 12mo. * in eight; A to G in twelves; H in 4; or pp. [16] 168 [8].
A few secrets to make Chinese varnish of all colours are added at the end.

1696. Traité de Mignature. . . . Troisiesme Edition, Reveuë, corrigée & augmentée par l'Autheur.
Paris, Christophe Ballard, 1696.
Small 8vo. ã, A to L, in eights; or pp. [16] 166 [10].
This does not contain the receipts about Chinese varnish. It is a reprint of 1684.

1708. Traité de la Peinture en Mignature. . . .
A La Haye, 1708.
12mo. * in eight (including frontispiece); A to M in twelves (with two plates of colours between 154-155); or pp. [16] 269 [11, and 8 of book advertisements].
This includes the *Traité*, but not exactly in the same order, and various chapters have been added. This treatise is therefore fuller and more complete.

1711. Traité de Mignature. . . . Nouvelle edition.
Paris, Christophe Ballard. 1711.
Small 8vo. ã in eight, A to P in fours and eights alternately; or pp. [16] 175 [1]. Reprint of 1684 or 1696.

1769. L'Ecole de la Miniature. . . . Nouvelle edition, revue, corrigée & augmentée.
Paris, J. B. G. Musier. 1769.
Small 8vo. 1 leaf, a, A to L in eights, M2; or pp. [2] vj [10] 179 [1 blank].
The *Traité de Miniature* occupies to p. 103; then comes another tract, *Méthode pour étudier l'Art de la Peinture*, which goes on to p. 179.

1802. L'école de la Mignature. . . . Nouvelle édition, revue, corrigée et augmentée.
Paris, Moutardier. An xi. 1802.
12mo. 2 leaves, a in six, A to O in alternate eights and fours, P in six; or pp. [4, 12] 178 [2 blank? wanting]. An inferior reprint of the preceding.

It would appear, therefore, that the *École* includes the *Traité* and another small treatise, and that the *Traité de la Peinture en Mignature* is an enlarged and rearranged edition of the earlier work. They are quite entitled, therefore, to be catalogued under distinct headings, but not without sufficient cross-references.

No. XII.

YULE AND CHRISTMAS:

THEIR PLACE IN THE GERMANIC YEAR.

BY

ALEXANDER TILLE, PH.D.

[*Read at a Meeting of the Society held on January 21st*, 1897.]

I.—THE GERMANIC YEAR.

THE oldest descriptive remark on the mode in which the Germanics divided their year is exactly eighteen hundred years old. It is found in the *Germania* of Tacitus, which, in all probability, was written A.D. 98, and runs thus: "They do not divide the year into so many seasons as we do. Only winter, spring, and summer have a name and a meaning among them; the name of autumn they know as little as its gifts."[1] It plainly means that the Germans of the first century of our era divided their year into three seasons, the names of which cannot, of course, have exactly corresponded to the Latin terms, *hiems*, *ver*, and *aestas*, each covering a quarter of a year. This statement has been assailed from various sides, and for various reasons, even Jacob Grimm expressing his belief that it was based on some misconception by Tacitus.[2] He understood Tacitus to refer solely to the meaning of the words, and remarked that the Romans did not use

[1] *Germania*, chap. xxvi., "Unde annum quoque ipsum non in totidem digerunt species: hiems et ver et aestas intellectum et vocabula habent; autumni perinde nomen et bona ignorantur."

[2] *Deutsche Mythologie*, p. 717.

the name of *autumnus* for the harvest of grain, but for the gathering of fruit, vintage, and after-math, things which were at that time unknown to the Germans. But such a view is scarcely tenable. For Tacitus speaks decidedly of the seasons as such, and in the case of *autumnus*, at the non-existence of which the Romans might wonder, he makes an explanatory and rather melancholy observation. In course of time, on a closer study of the questions connected with the Germanic partition of the year, extensive material has been discovered which undoubtedly goes to support Tacitus. Grimm himself lived to collect part of it, and to admit that he had been wrong.[1]

Another scholar has told us that he knows better than Tacitus, and that the ancient Germans had the word *herbst*, with the meaning "time of fruits." But that word seems to have meant originally, just like English *harvest*, the act of reaping the ripe grain and fruits, and not the time of their ripeness, though it was later used to denote the period of bringing in the harvest. Considerations of that kind can as little influence our judgment on Tacitus' report as can the fact that we are unable to say exactly which German word he meant to correspond with Latin *ver*, spring; for *spring*, *lent* (German *Lenz*), and *Frühling* are, as is generally admitted, of later growth.

The tri-partition of the Germanic year is an unshakable fact. It has been preserved for a very long time on legal ground. The three seasons answer to the three not-ordered law courts, *i.e.*, the three annual legal meetings which were fixed by tradition and not called by special royal ordinance. This fact is even admitted by Professor Weinhold of Berlin in his book on the German division of the year, who, on the whole, takes the view that the Germanics, just like the Romans, quartered their year according to solstices and equinoxes.[2] Professor Weinhold, however, there concedes so much as to acknowledge that those law courts were originally held at the beginning of winter, in spring, and about midsummer: whilst later the beginning of winter, midwinter, spring; midwinter, Easter, mid-

---

[1] *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, Leipzig, 1848, Vol. I., p. 74.
[2] *Über die deutsche Jahrteilung*, Kiel, 1862, p. 8.

summer; and February, May, autumn, took the place of those terms. Professor Weinhold gives[1] proofs for the several cases. Others agree with him in this proposition. So the greatest German authority on chronology, Grotefend, says:[2] "The tri-partition of the year has been preserved almost exclusively in juridical relations, and there finds its principal application in the so-called *dreidinge*, *echtendinge*, *echtendage*, or *etting*, the not-ordered law court of the country, which was held at three terms in the year. The terms vary, though with a general prevalence of midwinter (or beginning of winter), Easter, and midsummer (also the Twelve-nights, Easter, and Pentecost, or St. John's day), the basis of the tri-partition being a division of the year into winter, spring, and summer."

The capitulary of Louis the Pious, of 817, ordains "*in anno tria solummodo generalia placida*,"[3] which, of course, can only be taken as a codification of existing law, and not as a creation of a new jurisdiction. This usage lived on till at least the fifteenth century.[4] The fact of the early existence of three German annual law courts is so generally admitted that it is an exception for any authority to disagree. And even those who disagree have to account for a number of important indisputable facts. So Pfannenschmid,[5] believing that there were four Germanic law assemblies annually, finds it extremely strange that far more frequently only three such assemblies are enumerated, and that the examples of four assemblies are both rarer and later than those of three.

In Anglo-Saxon times the tri-partition of the year was preserved in the mode of paying the wages of female servants, who received a sheep for the feast at the beginning of winter, a measure of beans for the mid-lent dinner (Sunday *Invocavit*), and whey '*on sumera*' (corresponding

---

[1] *Über die deutsche Jahrteilung*, Kiel, 1862, pp. 18, 19.

[2] *Zeitrechnung des deutschen Mittelalters*, 1891, p. 90, *Jahreszeiten*.

[3] Sohm, *Fränkische Reichs- und Gerichtsverfassung*, p. 398.

[4] "1407 in unsen geheygeden gerichten to Luneborch drie des jares to den eddagen" (Centralarchiv zu Oldenburg), Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung*, II., 2, 194, Hannover und Leipzig, 1898.

[5] *Germanische Erntefeste*, 1878, p. 338.

to Old Icelandic '*at sumri*,' *i.e.*, June 9), which is about July 10.[1] It not only appears from the value of the gifts mentioned that the gift for the winter feast was the largest, but besides the enumeration of the three terms begins with that term, as the old Germanic, and so late as in the eleventh century the economic, year began with it.[2]

In the thirteenth century three terms existed in some districts of Eng-

---

[1] Thorpe's *Ancient Laws*, I., 436, 7, "Rectitudo Ancillae: Uni ancillae VIII. pondia annonae ad victum. I. ovis vel III. denarios, ad hiemale companagium, I. sester fabae ad quadragesimalem convictum. In estate suum hweig vel I. denarium; Be Wifmonna Metsunge. Dheowan wifmen VIII. pund cornes to mete, I. sceap odhdhe III. peningas to winter-sufle, I. syster beana to længten-sufle. hwæig on sumera odhdhe I. pening."

[2] Male servants also received three such gifts a year (*Ibid.*, I., 436, 7: "Omnibus ehtemannis jure competit Natalis firma, et Paschalis sulhæcer, id est, carruce acra, et manipulus Augusti in augmentum jure debiti recti; Eallum æhte-mannum gebyredh Midwinter feorm. and Eastor-feorm sulh-æcer. and hærfest-handful. to-eacan heora nyd-rihte"), though two of the terms for these had, in the eleventh century, shifted to the two Christian festivals, Christmas and Easter, while the third had, in the same direction, moved onwards to August. The payment of shepherds' wages is regulated not so much by an old tri-partition of the year as by the development of sheep during the year (*Ibid.*, I., 438, 9: "Pastoris ovium rectum est, ut habeat dingiam XII. noctium in Natali Domini, et I. agnum de juventute hornotina, et I. belflis, id est, timpani vellus, et lac gregis sui, VII. noctibus ante equinoctium, et blede, id est, cuppam plenam mesgui de siringia, tota estate; Sceaphyrdes riht is that he hæbbe twelf nihta dhingan to Middan-wintra. and I. lamb of geares geogedhe. and I. bel-flys. and his heorde meolc VII. niht æfter emnihtes dæge. and blede fulle hweges odhdhe syringe ealne sumor"), just as the payment of goatherds is (*Ibid.*, I., 438, 9: "Caprarius convenit lac gregis sui post festum Sancti Martini, et antea pars sua mesgui, et capricum anniculum, si bene custodiat gregem suum; Be Gât-hyrde. Gât-hyrde gebyredh his heorde meolc ofer Martinus mæsse dæig. and ær dham his dæl hwæges. and I. ticcen of geares geogodhe. gif he his heorde wel begymedh"). The dinners given to the farm servants varied considerably about 1030, being held partly at the two Christian festivals, Christmas and Easter, partly at other times (*Ibid.*, I., p. 440, 1: "In quibusdam locis datur firma Natalis Domini, et firma Paschalis, et firma precum ad congregandas segetes, et gutfirma ad arandum, et firma pratorum fenandorum et hreaccroppum, id est, macoli summitas, et firma ad macolum faciendum. In terra nemorosa, lignum plaustri; in terra uberi, caput macholi: et alia plurima fuerint a pluribus, quorum hoc viaticum sit, et quod supra diximus; on sumere [in some!] dheode gebyredh winter-feorm. Easter-feorm. ben-form for ripe. gyt-feorm for yrdhe mædh-med hreac-mete. æt wudu-lade wæn-treow. æt corn-lade hreac-copp. and fela dhinga de ic getellan ne mæig. Dhis is dheah myngung manna biwiste and eal that ic ær beforan ymberehte").

land.[1] On German ground it is the very same. To give at least one instance, which covers both the law courts and the terms of payment from the twelfth century: on Jan. 9, 1106, Archbishop Frederick I. of Cologne fixed at 14 solidi the fee to be paid to the provost of Gerresheim on each of the three annual law-days.[2]

However well established these facts are, etymology cannot be adduced in favour of an ancient tri-partition of the Germanic year; ancient names of three ancient seasons cannot be given; nay, etymology decidedly points to a dual division.[3] We have, therefore, to accept this as a fact, as well warranted as the tri-partition of the economic year itself. Whilst no other Aryan language possesses the same terms denoting a period of about a hundred and eighty days, all Germanic languages have in common the two words *winter* and *summer*, whilst there is no third season-name to join them. Nay, even more: the word *winter* appears in no Aryan language except the Germanic, all other Aryan languages using for the denomination of the coldest season of the year a word from a root *ghim* (*ghiem*) which means snow or storm (Greek χεῖμα); so that we have Latin *hiems*, Greek χειμών, Old Bulgarian and Zend *zima*, Sanskrit *hêmanta*. We know of no root from which winter might be derived, the derivation from *wind* being excluded on philological grounds. With the word *summer* it is not much different. It appears in all Germanic languages as the name of the warmer half of the year, but exists in no other Aryan language, notwithstanding that words from the same root, though formed by means of other suffixes and having a similar or the same significance, are found in several of them, such as Sanskrit *samâ*, year; Zend *hama*, summer; Armenian *amarn*, summer; Cymric *ham*, *haf*, summer.

---

[1] Nasse, *Über mittelalterliche Feldgemeinschaft in England*, Bonn, 1869, p. 51, Urbarium of the Monastery of Worcester of the thirteenth century, fol. 103b: "In hoc manerio sunt 8 virgatae servilis conditionis, quarum quaelibet, si censat, dabit ad quemlibet trium terminorum 12d pro omni servitio, ut dicunt."

[2] Kessel, *Der selige Gerrich, Stifter der Abtei Gerresheim*, Düsseldorf, 1877, p. 187.

[3] On the dual division of the original Aryan year, compare O. Schrader, *Die aelteste Zeitteilung des indogermanischen Volkes*, Berlin, Habel, 1878, pp. 11 ss., where the etymological parallels of *hiems* and *ver* are given.

When Hildebrand, in the Old-High-German *Hildebrandslied*, describes his thirty years' wanderings, he says:

"Ih wallôta sumaro enti wintro sehstic ur lante;"[1]

Anglo-Saxon legal language having the same phrase. So the laws of Ine provide that the wife of a ceorl who died, if she has a child, should be given, in addition to VI. shillings, "a cow in summer and an ox in winter";[2] also that a ceorl's close ought to be fenced winter and summer.[3] These two names do not stand alone as the supports of a dual division; there is a number of other phrases which show that the dual division of the year was extremely familiar to the Germanic mind. To denote the whole course of a year, especially in legal language, the terms were used: *im âse und im lôve*,[4] *im rûwen und im blôten*,[5] and *bî strô and bî grase*.[6]

Etymology shows that the dual division of the year was of Aryan home growth; and the very fact that etymology fails as to the tri-partition goes a long way to prove that the tri-partition is of foreign extraction. It certainly is so, and, as far as we can see, it is of Egyptian origin, although it was taken over by the Aryans very early, perhaps even at the time before they divided into self-dependent tribes which evolved idioms of their own. Ewald sums up his investigations as to the division of the Oriental year as follows:[7] "People in those countries of Asia and Africa, according to all evidence, had at first three equal seasons. These were fixed in the most ancient Egyptian almanac, and according to that fact in the hieroglyphic writings, the four months of each of these seasons

---

[1] Braune, *Althochdeutsches Lesebuch*, Halle, 1881, p. 77. A St. Gall document of A.D. 858 mentions two brothers, *Wintar* and *Sumar* (O. Schrader, *Die aelteste Zeitteilung des indogermanischen Volkes*, Berlin, Habel, 1878, p. 18). On the combats between Winter and Summer, compare Uhland's *Volkslieder*. Prof. Max Müller's attempts to show in Greek legends a great number of similar traits seem to me to be rather bold.

[2] *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England* (ed. by Thorpe), London, 1840, I., p. 126, xxxviii.: "cû on sumera. oxan on wintra."

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 126, xv.: "wintres ond sumeres."

[4] Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer*, III., 256, 258. [5] *Ibid.*, III., 249.

[6] *Ibid.*, III., 31, 62, 130, 190, 223; Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung des deutschen Mittelalters*, I., 77.

[7] *Die Altertümer des Volkes Israel*, 3rd. ed., pp. 455, 456.

being very simply counted as the first, the second, etc."[1] About the earliest Indian year Grimm remarks:[2] "In earliest antiquity the year seems to have been divided into three parts only, the Indians distinguishing either *vasanta*, spring; *grîschma*, summer; and *sarad*, raining time; or, according to the oldest commentator of the Veda: *grîschma*, summer; *varscha*, raining time; *hêmanta*, winter; and elsewhere six seasons. The Greeks had ἔαρ, spring; θέρος, summer; χειμών, winter." The early Aryans, like the Orientals in general, subdivided their three large seasons into six smaller, of the duration of about three-score days each. Ewald, after the passage just quoted, goes on to say:[3] "A further step was to divide each of the three seasons into halves and so count six seasons. This habit became law in ancient India, as is shown by Kâlidâsa's *Ritusanhâra*, but it must also have once been prevalent in Syriac and Arabic countries. The proof of this is the fact that, in the Syriac as well as in the Arabic almanac, frequently two subsequent months are distinguished as the first and second of the same 'tide,' and that tide after which they are called is evidently a season. The distinction between a first and second month according to such seasons has, it is true, only effect when the months, at least in principle, are at the same time calculated by means of the solar year. But, as we know, that was the case pretty early."[4]

These very same three-score-day tides are found among the Germanics, Eastern and Western. But the strange fact that no satisfactory Germanic or even Aryan etymology can be given for the oldest names of Germanic three-score-day tides, *Jiuleis* (Gothic), *Lida*, *Hlyda* (Anglo-Saxon), and perhaps *Rheda*, *Hreda* (Anglo-Saxon), and *Hornung*, *Horowunc* (German), seems

---

[1] Lepsius, *Chronologie der Aegypter*, I., p. 134.

[2] *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, 1848, I., p. 72. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 456.

[4] O. Schrader is the first to avoid the presupposition that the early Aryans based their partition of the year on a knowledge of the stars. He did so with full consciousness (O. Schrader, *Die aelteste Zeitteilung des indogermanischen Volkes*, Berlin, Habel, 1878, pp. 24), 32, and expressly says that the three roots used for denoting sun in the Aryan languages contain no element referring in any way to time or partition of time, whilst as regards the moon he attributes to her merely a secondary rank in that respect, and remarks that the origin of the months dates from no earlier period than the time when the Aryan tribe had split into several peoples.

to point to the probability that these names, like the institutions they denote, have their origin beyond the world of the Aryan family of languages and nations, and were borrowed from Egyptian and Syriac, or some other Oriental language, together with the six three-score-day tides which formed the course of a year. This probability is enhanced by the fact that Gothic *Jiuleis* in the forms *ἰλαῖος*, *ἰουλαῖος*, *ἰουλίηος*, and *ἰούλιος* is found to denote the time from Dec. 22 to Jan. 23 in old Cyprus,[1] which can scarcely be ascribed to chance. It is Jacob Grimm's merit to have gathered a number of important facts which show the same habit to have prevailed among several Aryan tribes, including the Germanics.

"Stress is to be laid," says he,[2] "on the connection of two (or even three) subsequent months through the same name, which connection seems to be a relic of an original partition of the whole of the year into six (or four)[3] parts. Thus, among the Anglo-Saxons, there appeared a double *lidha* for the pair June-July, which elsewhere also appears bound together as *brachot-houwot*, or the two *resaille-mois*, and a double *geola*. Thus, in Middle-High-German, there appears a double *ougest*, a double *wintermonat*, (a threefold *herbstmonat*). January and February are even much later singled out as the large and the small *horn*; nay, here and there we find the second of two months presented as the wife of the first, and a *sporkel* followed by a *spörkelsin* and an *ougest* by an *ögstin*. Likewise we find among the Slavs a small and a large *traven*, a small and a large *serpan*, where the small precedes the large one, whilst our small *horning* succeeds the large *horn*. (The Lüneburg Wenden also made a first *wintermonat*, September, precede the other, which was December.) According to Slavic order, however, the small *čerwen* preceded the large *čerwenec*. Something similar is found in the Celtic *midu* and *michrundu* for November and December; *ephan*, summer, and *gorephan*, main summer, for June and July.

---

[1] K. Fr. Hermann, *Über Griechische Monatskunde*, Göttingen, 1844, p. 64.

[2] *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, 1848, I., 110s.

[3] I put in round brackets what seems to me to be wrong in Grimm's argument. When the meaning of the common heading of two subsequent months was forgotten, and Roman quarters of years had become popular, a third month was sometimes added under the same name, a usage to which the intercalary month may have led.

Even the gipsies, whose month-names are given by Pott (I. 116), style June and July by the cognate names *nutibé* and *nunutibé*; and in Albanese γόστι and γοστοβιέστε for August and November we have the same thing. This coupling is in my eyes a testimony of great age. (The Attic calendar in the leap year added another Ποσειδεών after the first, as the Jews did after their *adar*, a *veadar* or other *adar*.) The Arabic lunar year still shows its months connected in six regular pairs: *rebî el avvel* and *rebî el accher*, *dschemâdi el avvel* and *dschemâdi el accher*, *dsulkade* and *dsulhedsche*. The Syriac year shows a *theschrin* I. and II. and a *khamm* I. and II.; whilst in the Persian and Jewish calendar this coupling has been lost. But it is quite apparent in the division of the Indian year into six parts, each of which embraces two months, most of which have cognate names, viz.: *vasanta*, spring, contains the months *madhu*, mead or honey, and *mâdhava*, honey sweet; *grîschma*, summer, contains the months *shukra*, the light one, and *shukhi*, the shining one; *varscha*, the raining tide, contains the months *nabhas*, cloud (Latin *nubes*, Slavic *nebo*, cloudy sky), and *nabhasja*, the cloudy one; *sarad*, sultry tide, contains the months *îscha* and *ûrgha*, the nourishing one; *hêmanta*, winter, contains the months *sahas*, strength, and *sahasja*, the strong one; *sisira*, dew tide, contains the months *tapas*, warmth, and *tapasja*, the warm one. The relation of the names *tapas* and *tapasja*, *nabhas* and *nabhasia*, *sahas* and *sahasja*, *madhu* and *mâdhava* is analogous to *sporkel* and *spörkelsin*, *ougest* and *öugstin*; *gosti* and *gostobieste*, *cerwen* and *cerwenec*, and the Sanskrit names given here seem to be more popular than the learned ones, which were fixed for the *âditjas*; and through the division of the Indian year into six seasons, the division of the Germanic year into three seasons, which immediately proceeds from it, is justified in a way that must be welcome to us." Further on[1] he says, "A connection between our month-names and the six Indian seasons, and the coupling always of two subsequent months, which proceeds from them, must be acknowledged."[2]

---

[1] *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, p. 113.

[2] In Mahâbhârata the six Indian seasons *vasanta*, *grîsma*, *varsa*, *çarad*, *hemanta*, and *çiçira* are represented as six men who play at golden and silver dice (O. Schrader, *Die aelteste Zeitteilung des indogermanischen Volkes*, Berlin, Habel, 1878, p. 22).

Grimm indicates in a general way the facts that point to an early six-partition of the Germanic year. But since his day so much material bearing upon the point has accumulated, that it is necessary to enumerate the most important items of it. On the Nether-Rhine the division of the year into six tides or periods of sixty days each was known till so late as the fourteenth century, although then it was thought to be antiquated as compared with the new Romano-Christian way of determining seasons. As the starting-point people then, as of old, took one of the three ends of the seasons, July 12, counting from then to September 17, November 11, January 13, March 17, and May 12, by ancient Germanic three-score-day tides or half seasons. Neither eight weeks nor nine weeks exactly covering these tides, eight weeks and nine weeks were alternately taken. On November 11, therefore, winter began, on March 17 early summer, and on July 12 later summer.[1]

It is rather difficult to say what were the names of these Germanic three-score-day tides, although in German legal and literary documents there occur quite numerous denominations which clearly cover a longer time than a month, and yet neither amount to three nor to four months.

Such are, *e.g.*, *in der brache*, *in der zwibrache*, *in der herbstsat*,[2] *in der erne*, *im houwet*, *im hanffluchet*,[3] *ze afterhalme und houwe*,[4] *in der bonenarne*.[5] Others are *im brâchet*, *im wimmot*, *in der sât*, *in dem snite*, *laubbrost*, and *laubrîse*,[6] *haberschnitt*, and *habererndte*, covering August and September, and

---

[1] "Urbarium of the Monastery of St. Victor, Xanten," in the State-Archive, Düsseldorf, under "Stift Xanten," R, No. 8a, leaf 8a. The passage was communicated to me, like all the unprinted material referring to the Rhine-country and Tirol, by Dr. Armin Tille of Bonn. It runs: "Item notandum, quod secundum antiquum modum computandi servicium potest poni per certos terminos infra dictos, scilicet a festo *Margarete* (ubi annus incipit) usque *Lamberti* sunt 9 ebdomade, item a Lamberti usque *Martini* sunt octo ebdomade, item a Martini usque ad *festum baculi*, quod est octava epiphanie, et sunt 9 ebdomade. Item a festo baculi usque *Gertrudis* sunt 9 ebdomade, item a festo Gertrudis usque ad festum *Pancracii* sunt 8 ebdomade, item a festo Pancracii usque Margarete sunt novem ebdomade et faciunt simul unum annum, scilicet 52 ebdomadas."

[2] Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer*, III., 546.

[3] *Ibid.*, I., 419.

[4] *Ibid.*, I., 673, 679.

[5] Neocorus, II., 75, 426; Weinhold, *Deutsche Jahrteilung*, 1862, p. 13.

[6] Weinhold, *Die deutschen Monatnamen*, Halle, 1869, p. 2.

sometimes even including the time from July 25 to August 1.[1] To these *lenz* (lent, A.S. *lengten*) and *herbst* (harvest) in their medieval senses are to be added, the latter being on German ground frequently replaced by *augst* (August), which, however, covers a longer time than August, so that July 25, St. James's day, can be called *Jacobstag im augst.*[2] It was out of such words that the Germanic month-names were formed in the second half-millennium of our era, after the Roman calendar had become popular among the Germanics. So Professor Weinhold[3] seems to be of opinion that *in der erne* is older than the month-name *ernemânot*; that *im brâchet* and *im höuwet* are older than *brâchmonat*; and that *hëumat* and *im wimmot* are older than *windumemanot*: and he expressly states that, according to his belief, *in der sât* and *in dem snite* have given origin to *sâtmân* and *schnitmonat*, and that *laubbrost* and *laubrîse* under our eyes become, by being taken in a narrower sense, something like month-names.[4] Beside these words English expressions like *fall*, *backend*, "*houl o' winter*" are to be placed, and perhaps, also, two other words which later were used to correspond to Latin *ver* and *autumnus*. For *ver* the Western Germanics took a root, *lang*, perhaps connected with *long*, forming out of it a term for the time when the days grow longer (Old-High-German *langiz*, *lenzo*, *lenzin*; Middle-High-German *lenze*; Dutch *lente*; Anglo-Saxon *lengten*, *lencten*; English *lent*), which, however, cannot be traced beyond the Western Germanic, not to mention the common Germanic.[5] This makes it rather likely that it was not the name of an old three-score-day tide, but was formed new. The term adopted to correspond to *autumnus* is also confined to Western Germanic, although its root is common Aryan property. It is Old-High-

---

[1] Grotefend, *Die Zeitrechnung des deutschen Mittelalters*, 1891, I., 79.

[2] Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung*, I., 87.

[3] *Die deutschen Monatnamen*, Halle, 1869, pp. 1, 2.

[4] If Neocorus, II., 315, explains *in howman edder in der howarne* (Weinhold, *Ibid.*, p. 13), it follows that he regarded the term *howarne* as still more popular than the newly formed word *howman*.

[5] Since the fifteenth century it has been in German supplanted by the term *Frühling* (from *früh*, Gothic *frô*, * early; Greek πρωί), and in English by *spring* (cp. 1 *Sam.* ix. 26, "about the spring of the day"; Shakespeare, 2 *Henry IV.* iv. 4. 35, "since the middle summer's spring").

German *herbist*, Middle-High-German *herbest*, Dutch *herfst*, Anglo-Saxon *hærfest*, English *harvest*, and belongs to Latin *carpere*, to pluck, and Greek καρπός, fruit.[1]

Yet more important than these rather vague terms are several others which can be proved to have exactly covered a Germanic tide of three-score days. They are the more striking since, in two cases, it is simply Roman month-names which are used for denoting a tide of two months, so that two subsequent Roman months among the Germanics are frequently called by the same name, the first being called the former, and the second the latter month of that designation; whilst some Germanic names of the same kind are of very great age.

The Scandinavian summer of six months is divided into three tides called *Vaarmoaner*, *Sumarmoaner*, and *Haustmoaner*;[2] *herbst* as denoting the two months September and October is very common in the Middle Ages, so that the former month is called *der erste herbst*, and the latter *der andere herbst*.[3]

In a Gothic *calendarium* of the sixth century[4] November, or *Naubaimbair*,

---

[1] Scandinavian *haust* or *höst* is probably to be derived from *August*, which in the Middle Ages appeared as *aust*. In English the Germanic word *harvest* in the later sense of a season was completely superseded by Romance *autumn*.

[2] Weinhold, *Altnordisches Leben*, Berlin, 1856, pp. 371-383.

[3] Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung des deutschen Mittelalters*, I., 84; Weinhold, *Deutsche Monatnamen*, pp. 15, 42. There appears even a *dritt herbst* for November. The naming of three subsequent months as first, second, and third *augst* or *herbst* admits of several explanations. The Roman quarter of a year having taken the place of the old third, it was but natural that all the three months forming it should have received a common name; there is no doubt that in this way *herbst*, which simply meant *harvest*, advanced to the meaning of the season of autumn. This is the more likely, since the tripling of the month-name is found just in that season, which, according to Tacitus, among the Germanics had no name. Beda also has such a tripling in the case of the Lida month, though for another purpose, viz., for forming an intercalary month for the leap year. His June, July, and third Lida covering to a large extent the same ground as the July, August, and September, called the three *herbste* or *augste*, it may seem probable that the leap year had also to do with the origination of the series of three months bearing the same name. That it was August which was doubled may be inferred from Northic *tvímánadhr*, double-month, which is the name for August, and has not been understood by Professor Weinhold.

[4] Moritz Heyne, *Ulfilas*, Paderborn und Münster, 1885, p. 226.

is called *fruma Iiuleis*, which presupposes that December was called **aftuma Iiuleis*; in Beda's list of Germanic month-names[1] it is stated that the Anglo-Saxons called December and January together *Giuli*, for which, later, the terms *ærra Geola* and *æftera Geola* were used; in the same place Beda states that the Anglo-Saxons called June and July *ærra Lida* and *æftera Lida* respectively; in Middle Germany up to this day January is called *der grosse Horn*, February *der kleine Horn*. Both names together occur in Christian Wolf's *Mathematical Dictionary*, Leipzig, 1742, which borrowed all kinds of things from the dialects spoken in Saxony; but *Hornung* (*i.e.*, small Horn or son of Horn) is found among the list of German month-names composed by Charlemagne, and brought down to us by his biographer Eginhart.[2] It being the only name in the list which is not a compound of *mânôth*, it is bound to be of ancient German origin. The forms occurring elsewhere are *Hornung*, *Horning*, *horner* and *horn*.[3]

As a rule, *der erst herbst* is September,[4] and *der ander herbst* October.[5] But November also appears as *der ander herbst*,[6] though more frequently as *der drit herbst*,[7] September also being called *Uberherbst*.[8] It shows a state of things a little further advanced when, as is frequently the case, *der erste* and *der andere herbst* are replaced by *der erste* and *der andere herbstmonat*;[9] likewise there are numerous examples for November

---

[1] *De Temporum Ratione*, chap. xv. [2] *Vita Caroli Magni*, chap. xxix.

[3] Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung des deutschen Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, 1891, I., 86. I should be inclined to see in *Horn* the name of an old German three-score-day tide, just as in Yule and Lida. Compare on *Horn*, however, Weinhold, *Deutsche Monatnamen*, p. 45.

[4] Diefenbach, *Novum Glossarium*, 32; *Codex Germanicus Monacensis*, 93, 398, 700, 730; *Grâzer Kalender*; "der erst heribst," *Codex Germanicus Monacensis*, 349.

[5] *Klingenberger Kronik*, 343; Diefenbach, *Novum Glossarium*, 32; *Codex Germ. Monac.*, 93, 398, 480, 700, 730, 771; *Grâzer Kalender*; Huber, "der ander herbst," *Giess. MS.*, 978; Weinhold, *Die deutschen Monatnamen*, pp. 41, 42.

[6] *Codex Germ. Monac.*, 32.

[7] Diefenbach, *Novum Glossarium*, 32; *Codex Germ. Monac.*, 349, 730.

[8] *Tegernseer Kalender*; Weinhold, *Ibid.*, p. 42.

[9] Grimm, *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, I., p. 85; *Zellweger*, No. 191, a. 1407; Weinhold, *Deutsche Monatnamen*, p. 15, note, and pp. 42, 43, where a long list of cases is given. November is sometimes called *der dritt herbistmanot* (*Ibid.*, p. 43), and December *der vierd herbistmonad* or *letst herbistmoneth* (Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung*, I., 84), a fact which leads us beyond Roman quarters of years into Germanic thirds of years. *Unser frauen*

being called *der erst winter*, and December being called *der ander winter* (and even January being named *manot des hindrosten winters*);[1] so November is also called *der erst wintermaneid*,[2] and December *der ander wintermaneid*,[3] or *der lest wintermond*.[4] On Bavarian ground, a Tegernsee calendar[5] calls March and April *das erst ackermonat* and *das ander ackermonat*;[6] to these cases two others are to be added, in which Roman month-names are used for the same purposes. There is quite an abundance of instances in which May is called *der erst may*, and June *der ander may*;[7] the same holds good for *der erst augst*, meaning August, and *der ander augst*, meaning September, so that even the term occurs: *in den tzweyen augsten*.[8] In the Diocese

---

dulltag in dem ersten herbstmanode, Sept. 8, A.D. 1290, Pilgram; Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung*, I., 68.

[1] See Weinhold, *Deutsche Monatnamen*, p. 61. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 62. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 62.

[4] Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung*, I., 208, where also an instance is given of February being called *der letzte wintermonat*, A.D. 1536, Ulm, which again points to four winter months or Germanic thirds of years.

[5] Pfeiffer, *Germania*, IX., 192 f.; Weinhold, *Deutsche Monatnamen*, 14.

[6] Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung*, I., 1.

[7] Weinhold, *Deutsche Monatnamen*, pp. 13, 50, where a whole group of old Bavarian almanacs is mentioned which has this peculiarity; Grimm, *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, 1848, I., 84, according to a Cassel manuscript of A.D. 1445. About some Alemannic and Swabian almanacs, comp. Weinhold, *Ibid.*, p. 15.

[8] *Muglen bei Kovachich*, p. 4; Grimm, *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, 1848, I., p. 85. In some Bavarian almanacs August and September are called *der erste* and *der andere augst* (Diefenbach, *Novum Glossarium Latino-germanicum*, Francofurti, 1857, 34, and *Tegernseer Fischbüchlein*); so it is on Alemannic and Swabian ground (Weinhold, *Deutsche Monatnamen*, p. 15; *Codex Germanicus Monacensis*, 32; Diefenbach, *Novum Glossarium*, 34; Mone, *Anzeiger*, VIII., 496); *der ander ougst* is September (Grimm, *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, p. 85). Among the German communities of Valsugan and on the hills between Brenta and Drau, August is called *erster Aux*, and September *änderts Aux*, a form in which it also appears in some Roman documents of Rhaetia (Hormayr, *Geschichte der gefürsteten Grafschaft Tirol*, Tübingen, 1806, Part I., Section 1, p. 141). *Der erste august* means August in *Tegernseer Fischbuch*; *der erst awgst*, *Giessen MS.*, 978; *der erst awst*, *Codex Germanicus Monacensis*, 32; whilst *der ander augst* may be August (*Codex Germanicus Monacensis*, 93, 398, 700, 848, 3384; *Giessen MS.* 978; Gmund's *Kalender*; *Gräzer Kalender*; Huber's *Kalender*; *der andere auste*, Diefenbach, *Novum Glossarium*, 4), or September (Megenberg, Diefenbach, *Novum Glossarium*, 34; *Tegernseer Fischbuch* (*der ander august*)). In the xiii. *comuni* there are even three *Agester*, meaning August, September, October (*Cimbr. Wörterbuch*, 107; Weinhold, *Die deutschen Monatnamen*, p. 32).

their year consisted were sixths, and it is apparent that of these tides either two could each time be grouped together to form thirds, or three could be grouped together each time to form halves. At the same time the simple fact of sixths being the units constituent of the Germanic year excludes any quartering of the year, since a quarter would consist of one-sixth and a half, and would thus most seriously interfere with the unity of the three-score-day tide. If Professor Weinhold[1] says the dual division of the Germanic year was dislodged by a tri-partition, he is entirely in error; for so little can be said of a dislodgment of one mode by the other that for a long prehistoric period both existed peacefully alongside each other, and appear thus at the dawn of history. The Oriental tri-partition of the year would probably not have so deeply rooted itself in the Germanic mind had it not been supported by the economic and climatic conditions of the country they emigrated to. There the most decided season, the winter, fills, on an average, a period of exactly four months, which naturally leads to a division of the rest of the year into two equal parts of four months each. And the economic year was no less naturally divided into three parts—the rest of the plough, the cultivation and reaping of the grass, and the harvest.[2] There is no reason to take refuge in speculations about symbols and the religious opinions of the early Germanics to explain their division of the year. Economic conditions have at all times weighed much heavier than fancies. The centre of animal activity, as well as of the strivings, hopes, and dreams of men, was in pre-Roman Germanic times, as it is now, to win food and to get on in life—in early times by hunting and keeping cattle, later on by cultivation of meadows, and finally by agriculture in addition. Then as now the endless generation of human beings and the endless competition for the means of subsistence among them, which two factors have at all times determined the fates of families, tribes, nations, and races, pressed upon individuals, and compelled them to work by leaving them, if unwilling to do so, the alternative of perishing.

---

[1] *Deutsche Jahrteilung*, 1862, p. 7.
[2] Weinhold, *Deutsche Jahrteilung*, 1862, p. 7.

II.—THE BEGINNING OF THE ANGLO-GERMAN YEAR.

Both Caesar and Tacitus tell us that the Germans did not count by days as the Romans did, but by nights, reckoning the *vigilia* or eve as part of the following day.[1] This habit lived on unbroken through the Middle Ages, and is still living among us, so that we count by fortnights instead of by fourteen days, and speak of the Twelve-nights of Christmas-time. It was taken over by the early Church, as we know by so good an authority as the Venerable Beda, as regards festivals at least.[2] In the same way the Germanics reckoned by winters instead of by summers, counting the winter and the summer which followed it as one year, a custom which, however, is not exclusively Germanic.[3] The *Saxon Chronicle* abounds with examples of that usage.[4] Though it is generally the term *winter* which is used thus, it is by no means exclusively so, other terms,

---

[1] Caesar, *Bellum Gallicum*, Book VI., chap. xviii.: "Spatia omnis temporis non numero dierum, sed noctium finiunt; dies natales et mensium et annorum initia observant, ut noctem dies subsequatur." Tacitus, *Germania*, chap. xi.: "Coeunt nisi quid fortuitum et subitum incidit, certis diebus, cum aut inchoatur luna aut impletur; nam agendis rebus hoc auspicatissimum initium credunt. Nec dierum numerum, ut nos, sed noctium computant; sic constituunt, sic condicunt; nox ducere diem videtur." Later instances are given from law literature by Weinhold, *Deutsche Jahrteilung*, notes 2, 3, 11, 12, and 13; from documents by Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung des deutschen Mittelalters*, Hannover, 1891, I., p. 131, and 1898, II., 202, under *Nacht*.

[2] *De Temporum Ratione*, chap. v.: "Merito autem quaeritur, quare populus Israel, qui diei ordinem iuxta Moysi traditionem a mane semper usque ad mane servabat, festa tamen omnia sua, sicut et nos hodie facimus, vespere incipiens, vespere consummarit dicente legislatore: A vespera usque ad vesperam celebrabitis sabbata vestra."

[3] Manilius, *Astronomicon*, "per quinquaginta brumas"; and Martialis, "ante brumas triginta." On the parallels between night and winter and between day and summer, see O. Schrader, *Die aelteste Zeitteilung des indogermanischen Volkes*, Berlin, Habel, 1878, pp. 12, 44 ss.

[4] The Parker MS. of the *Saxon Chronicle* (ed. by Earle in "*Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*," Oxford, 1865, p. 2) begins: "thy geare the wæs agan fram Cristes acennesse cccc. wintra and xciiii. uuintra," and in the second paragraph *gear* and *winter* are used as synonyms ("and he hæfde thæt rice xvi. gear . . . and heold xvii. winter . . . heold vii. gear . . . ricsode xvii. gear . . . riscode xxxi. wintra . . . heold xxxi. wintra," *Ibid.*, p. 2). The oldest part of the version belongs to the second half of the ninth century (R. Wülker, *Grundriss zur Geschichte der angelsächsischen Literatur*, Leipzig, 1885, § 509).

like *louprise* in the Alemannic dialects, being employed in the same sense.[1] Thus there can be no doubt that the Germanic year began with the beginning of winter, and not in the middle of it, as did the Roman year with its dogmatic and unpractical way of dividing time. But when exactly was the Germanic New Year? On an average, in Germany actual winter sets in about the middle of November, when it ceases to be possible to leave cattle, swine, sheep, and horses on the pasture grounds to seek their own food; when it begins to freeze; and when snowfalls become very frequent. There is no doubt that for purely nomadic cattle-keeping tribes, such as at the dawn of history the Germanics certainly were, this is the term which compels them to change all their summer habits, and therefore marks the beginning of a new season in the most incisive way. It may, therefore, be regarded as certain that the Germanic winter did not begin later than at mid-November. But in order to determine whether it did not, perhaps, begin earlier, we need other means than mere economic speculation. We saw above that the Germanics in prehistoric times took over the Oriental year, which was divided into six three-score-day tides. Now the oldest such tide we know of among Germanics was the *Iiuleis* tide among the Goths of the sixth century.[2] It exactly covered the Roman months, November and December, November being called *fruma Iiuleis*. It is more than unlikely that the beginning of the year should have interfered with any such three-score-day tide; therefore the conclusion will be allowed that it rather began with the beginning of one. Thus we should have to assume either November 1 or September 1 to have been the beginning of the Germanic year. But September bearing in Germany entirely the character of a summer month,—nay, towards the end of August, the heat frequently being the greatest in the whole course of the year,—the beginning of the Germanic year at the beginning of September is practically out of the question, so that only November 1 remains as a possible beginning.

---

[1] Weinhold, *Deutsche Jahrteilung*, pp. 12 and 19; just as the Bavarians counted after autumns (*Lex Baiuvariorum*, VIII., 19, 4; Weinhold, *Ibid.*).

[2] The periods of three scores of days I call *tides*, the unities of two tides I call Germanic *seasons*, and the unities of three tides I call *half-years*.

Among the Goths of the sixth century *fruma Iiuleis* and November were apparently absolutely identical, as appears from St. Andrew's day—which is marked down in that calendar as *Fruma Iiuleis* 31—and from some other saints' days. All we are allowed to conclude from the fact, however, is that the Goths of the sixth century had taken over the Roman calendar, naming the Roman months by the home-made names of those Germanic tides which approximately covered them. It by no means follows from this fact that each of the Germanic pre-Roman three-score-day tides exactly covered two Roman months. It would be an astounding incident indeed if that had been the case, and only an extremely rare chance could account for it. Knowing that the Indian months began shortly after the middle of the Roman months,[1] we have every reason to assume something similar for the Germanic three-score-day tides. This assumption is supported by a great number of singular facts. Had each of the six ancient Germanic tides not exactly, but fairly covered two subsequent Roman months, we should have to expect that the same would be the case with the German month-names which sprung up for the denomination of the Roman months. But the contrary is the case. To quote a witness beyond suspicion, I cite Professor Weinhold,[2] who says: "We find a wavering of the names between several months: *ackermonat* wavers between March and April; *hartmonat* between November, December, and January; *lasemânt* means December and January; *hornung* means January and February; *hundemân* is found to be applied to June, July, and August; *rosenmânt* to June and July; *sâtmânt* to September and October; *slachtmân* to October, November, and December; and *sommermonat* to June and July: the names containing the constituent *vol* (ful) occur for September, November, December, January, and February, and *wolfmonat* appears denoting November, December, and January"—a list which could easily be increased. It is now generally admitted that the Germanic month-names are a very late product, and that they were merely formed for the purpose of replacing the Latin names. If, then, the ancient Germanic three-score-day tides extended from about the

[1] Grimm, *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, 1848, I., p. 75.
[2] *Die deutschen Monatnamen*, Halle, 1869, p. 2.

middle of one Roman month to the middle of the second next, it was bound to happen that, at the time when the Roman month-names were taken over, they were applied to the interval between the middles of two consecutive Roman months, which means neither more nor less than that each month-name could be used for two months; so during the period of transition it could scarcely be avoided that *e.g.* the term November was at some places used for the time from October 15 to November 15; whilst on others it was, with equal right, made to cover the time from November 15 to December 15. When, later, the Latin name was replaced by a German word, the characteristic held good. In consequence it could not fail to happen, even in neighbouring places, that, of two consecutive Roman months, sometimes the first and sometimes the second was called by the one Latin name. Finding, as we do, that the Goths called *Iiuleis* the time from November 1 to December 31, and the Anglo-Saxons called *Geola* the time from December 1 to January 31, we can scarcely help assuming that *Iiuleis* originally covered a period from about November 15 to January 15, and that, at the taking over of the Roman calendar, among the Goths that name was shifted a fortnight back, and among the Anglo-Saxons a fortnight forward, so as to create an incongruence of a whole Roman month. This argument must needs lead us to the conclusion that the Germanic *Iiuleis* tide extended originally from about mid-November to mid-January; for had it extended from mid-October to mid-December, we should have to expect a wavering of the Yule tide between October-November and November-December, and not between November-December and December-January. All this points to the conclusion that a Germanic three-score-day tide began originally about the middle of November, and that the beginning of it was at the same time the beginning of the Germanic year. This result is supported by the Rhenish Urbary of the fourteenth century from the Monastery of St. Victor, Xanten,[1] in which the terms of the six three-score-day tides are July 12, Sept. 17, Nov. 11, Jan. 13, March 17, and May 12, Martinmas being marked out as a term as close to the middle of November as possibly can be expected.

The idea of the Germanic year beginning about Martinmas is not new.

[1] Staatsarchiv of Düsseldorf, under "Stift Xanten," R, No. 8[a], leaf 8[a].

Fin Magnusen[1] remarked, about a century ago, that the Germanics began their year about the Advent tide, which for a long time began with the Sunday after Martinmas. Even Weinhold admits that Martinmas coincides with the actual beginning of winter,[2] in which character it is clearly marked by the popular rimes:

"Sanct Martin
Feuer im Kamin"[3]

and

"Sanct Märten Miss
Is der Winter wiss";[4]

whilst, on the other hand, he maintains that the Germans began their year about the same time as the Romans began a new quarter of the year, *i.e.*, on September 29, St. Michael's Day. It is true he does not even attempt to prove that assertion historically, but with a few vague remarks, which can scarcely be taken seriously, jumps over the whole point which ought to have been the centre of his investigation. It never occurs to him that the Goths regarded November and December as their *Iiuleis* tide, and that, if their year was not begun at the 1st of November, it was bound to commence on the beginning of September, when another three-score-day tide took its inception. Only a man who has never in his life left his study for fresh air can maintain that winter began at the close of September![5] Did Professor Weinhold realize that spring began then at the end of January, when Germany as a rule is ice-bound for another month and a half—two to three months before cattle are able to pasture on the meadows? He had not even the courage to follow out the consequences; but makes spring begin "in March," and summer at the summer solstice! To do him no injustice in any respect, I shall assume that the phrase "in March" (which implies thirty-one days to select from) is meant

[1] *Specimen Calendarii gentilis*, p. 1018, according to Pfannenschmid, *Germanische Erntefeste*: p. 512: "Suspicor vulgarem inter veteres Germanos annij adventum posterius inter christianos certo modo mutatum fuisse in adventum domini sive initium anni ecclesiastici."

[2] *Über die deutsche Jahrteilung*, Kiel, 1862, p. 5.

[3] Graesse, *Des deutschen Landmanns Practica*, Dresden, 1858, p. 178.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 178.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 718.

to mean the middle of March. Then we have a winter extending from the end of September to the middle of March; a spring extending from the middle of March to June 24; and a summer extending from June 24 to the end of September (which seems to mean September 29), *i.e.*, a winter of more than five months and a half! a spring of three months and nine days! and a summer of three months and five days!—a calculation which certainly does all honour to the arithmetical attainments of our Germanic ancestors and their distinct sense of the equality of three thirds! Would one take the phrase "in March" as "in the end of March," the time when storks and swallows return in flocks and the grass begins to grow green again, we should have a winter of full six months, a spring of not quite three months, and a summer of a little more than three months.

But perhaps one must not draw the consequences from these ill-considered assumptions. The truth is, that a beginning of the Germanic winter about the end of September is absolutely untenable, that it really took place about the middle of November, while the end of September did not become of importance as a dividing-point of the year until the introduction of the Roman quartering of the year, under the reign of which a new quarter began on October 1, and was fixed by the Church on September 29, *i.e.*, on Michaelmas.

Having, at last, arrived at the starting-point, it will be necessary to cast a glance over the whole of the Germanic year, and to draw once and for all the theoretical conclusions from that result. Counting by original Germanic half-years, *summers* and *winters*, we have to fix the other junction-point of the two at mid-May, a term dear to all who have the happiness of receiving house rents in Scotland. Counting with Oriental-made thirds of years, or Germanic seasons, we have to close the winter and begin the early summer at mid-March, and to close the early summer and begin the late summer at mid-July. If this really be the old Germanic division of the year, it is bound to be preserved in all kinds of recollections and institutions: above all, in legal institutions, in popular tradition, in folk-belief and rustic custom, in festivals and bonfires, and, last but not least, in ecclesiastical habits which, as far as they were created after the fifth century of our era, reflect an enormous amount of Germanic tradition and thought.

III.—SOLSTICES AND EQUINOXES.

Jacob Grimm, as has been shown already, had a perfect grasp of six-fold division of the year found among the Germanics at the daw history. And though he did not know that it had been borrowed the Orient, and probably ultimately from Egypt, and that it was b means genuine and common Aryan property, yet he did not fail to how deep-rooted it was in the legal, cultural, and economic conditio our ancestors. It is a very strange fact that he should have thou knowledge of two solstices and two equinoxes, together with a quart of the year, reconcilable with the conclusions as to the Aryan ye general, which of necessity must be drawn from a six-fold division. he been aware that these two ways of looking at the course of the were mutually exclusive, he would have been led to a further examir of each, and then would have found that a cognizance of solstices equinoxes must be denied to the early Aryans, as well as to the Germ before their acquaintance with the Roman calendar; that the quarteri the year is of purely Roman origin, and is not found elsewhere; that is no historical evidence whatever for a celebration of solstices equinoxes among the Germanics in their pre-Roman time; that phil and folklore, the history of the Christian Church, and the history of culture all point to a three-fold partition of the year with the begi about the middle of November. It was Jacob Grimm's way to r our ancient ancestors as speculative philosophers who stood aloof fro struggle for existence, and who shaped their yearly course accordin their own fancies and their belief in gods; and he failed to see that the economic conditions which, in primeval times, as they do in our fixed all the more important features of daily and yearly life, leaving a very limited realm to a manifestation of personal likes and dislikes; that that realm gets smaller and smaller every step we go further into the past.

Jacob Grimm was a king in his kingdom of Germanic philology, even where he stumbled on his royal road, he could not help indi the way to walk safely. But what about those who followed his r

Was it not strange that they should think his stumbles worthy, above all, of imitation, that they should altogether neglect his useful hints and the material gathered by him which pointed in the right direction? It looks like a joke in the history of Germanic antiquarian studies, that the man who after Grimm made this subject his special study, and devoted years to it, should have wasted all his energy in the attempt to prove that the Germanics in pre-Roman times had exactly the same year as the Romans; that they, therefore, had nothing to get from them, and rejoiced in quartering their year and celebrating imaginary solstices and equinoxes.[1]

The observation of the change of cold in winter and heat in summer is one thing, and the movement of the rising-point of the sun on the horizon is another. If some peoples of antiquity sought to find a causal connection between the two things, that connection was hopelessly wrong, the proper relation of the two lines of observation having been known only since Copernicus, *i.e.*, since the sixteenth century. That primitive people were bound to connect them is by no means true, and it is more than doubtful whether the next thing would be to observe so-called solstices and equinoxes. The fixing of the date at which day and night are exactly equal lacks entirely in economic interest and significance, and certainly never affected the minds of primitive peoples. The observation of so-called solstices, on the other hand, is extremely difficult. Whilst in autumn and spring the rising-point of the sun visibly shifts from day to day, it scarcely shifts at all from the beginning of December to the middle of January, and from the beginning of June to the middle of July. Even the astronomers whom Caesar had at his disposal were not able to fix the solstices and equinoxes actually; and although he ordered the winter solstice to take place on December 25, and the summer solstice on June 24, they persistently and obstinately disobeyed—the winter solstice making a point of taking place on December 23, A.D. 1; on December 22, A.D. 101; on December 21, A.D. 201; on December 20, A.D. 301; on December 19,

[1] So even Heino Pfannenschmid seems to think when he explains his theory of the Germanic year in his otherwise excellent book on *Germanische Erntefeste im heidnischen und christlichen Cultus* (Hannover, 1878, pp. 16 ss. and 326 ss).

A.D. 401; on December 18, A.D. 601; on December 17, A.D. 801; and so on; so that in 1501 it was wicked enough to take place on December 12. The spring equinox and autumnal equinox apparently shared the delight in moving backward by eighteen hours a century, and shifted in the same degree away from March 21 and September 22.

It was not earlier than at their close contact with the Romans that the Germanics became acquainted (as with other Roman institutions) with solstices and equinoxes,[1] although not with their true astronomical dates, but with the pseudo-equinoxes and solstices of the Julian calendar, to which their wise men faithfully stuck for a millenium, whilst popular tradition knew nothing of these foreign-made goods. Nevertheless these innovations brought the ancient Germanics face to face with a task which may be called philological. They were compelled to create new words for the new conceptions with which they were made familiar, and they chose the simplest way that offered, by merely translating the Latin terms. But not all tribes fulfilling that task in the same way, there arose considerable divergence in the expressions used, from which divergence even now we can see that the Germanics had no ancient common word for them, such as they had for *winter* and *summer*. Nay, they even took over the particular limitations with which the Latin expression *solsticium* was used. *Solsticium* is in Latin, with a few late exceptions, exclusively used for the summer solstice. How well aware the Roman mind was of that appears from the fact that the adjective *solsticialis* refers, even in late Latin, exclusively to summer and the middle of it, and is used as the contrary of *brumalis*. The name for the shortest day of the year was simply *bruma* (supposed to be a contraction of *brevissima* [*dies*]), which also meant the whole of winter. Germany herself has evolved four words for solstice, all four of which apply to the summer solstice alone: *sunwende*, *sungiht*, *sunstede*, and *sommertag*. Grotefend,[2] who maintains that by *solsticium* without an additional qualification the summer solstice is, in most cases,

[1] Kuhn's article in Zacher's *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, 1868, I., 118, is not to be taken seriously, at least so far as the Germanics are concerned. He fails to give any proof for their knowledge of a solar year with solstices and equinoxes.

[2] *Zeitrechnung des deutschen Mittelalters*, 1891, I., p. 178.

meant, is unable to give even a single instance from a medieval document in which a winter solstice occurs, and (although he heads his paragraph *Solsticium estivale, brumale*) gives examples solely of *solsticium estivale*. In another paragraph, however,[1] he quite properly remarks that the whole of the following expressions: *sonnwenden, sonnabenden, sonnenbenttag, sunnbenden, sunnewenttag, sunibentag, sunwende, sunnstede, sungichten, sungicht, suniich*, apply to the summer solstice alone. This amounts to the fact, that no medieval instance is known of December 25, or any of the days about it, having ever been called solstice in the German language: nay, that there is no medieval word *wintersonnwende* or the like, the corresponding term in New-High-German being of quite modern growth. Wherever the word *sunnewende* occurs in the Middle-High-German poetry of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries there is no doubt that it can apply to the summer solstice solely. No poet or writer of prose thinks of adding any adjective to make that clear.[2] *Sonnenwende* is turning of the sun; *sungicht* is walk of the sun; and *sunstede* is standing of the sun—three quite different things. These terms do not occur all over Germany, but are restricted to several dialects. So *sunstede* is exclusively Frisian, at least as far as the continent is concerned, for it also occurs in Anglo-Saxon, thus appearing to be an Anglo-Frisian term.[3] From this we may conclude that the Germanics became acquainted with the Roman summer solstice at a time when the Western Germanics had already separated into Germans and Anglo-Frisians, but before the community of speech between Angles and Frisians was broken up. This is the more likely, as Frisian and

---

[1] *Zeitrechnung des deutschen Mittelalters*, I., p. 181.

[2] "Hiute ist der ahte tac nâch sunewenden," Iwein, 114; "ze einen sunewenden," *Nibelungenlied*, 32, 4, and Lachmann's *Nibelungen Not*, 2023, 1; "vor disen sunwenden," *Ibid.*, 678, 3; 694, 3; "zen næhsten sunwenden," *Ibid.*, 1352, 4; 1424, 4; *Wigalois*, 1717; "an sunwenden âbend," *Nibelungen Not*, 1754, 3; "ze sunewenden," *Tristan*, 5987; "Sant Johans sunewenden tac," Ls., 2, 708.

[3] It is found, *e.g.*, in an Anglo-Saxon treatise on astronomy based entirely on Beda's work, *De Ratione Temporum*: Thomas Wright, *Popular Treatises on Science* written during the Middle Ages in Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Norman, and English, London, MDCCCXLI., Historical Society of Science Publication, pp. 8, 9: "Aestas is sumor, se hæfdh sunn-stede; hiems is winter, se hæfdh otherne sunn-stede."

English have in common another word for the same notion: I *sumerdey*, English *summer night*,[1] whilst *sommertag* for solstice is spora German. This being the state of matters among the Western Germ nobody will wonder that the several Northern Germanic tribes e almost each a name of their own. How could it have been otherwise, they were not acquainted with the summer solstice until after the settled in the several parts of the north! Thus Danish has *Solhve* throwing of the sun, from which in modern times is derived *Vintersol festen*. Norwegian, likewise, has *Solkverv* and *Solhverv*, with the m derivatives *Sommersolhvervet* and *Vintersolhverv*. But Swedish has *So* with the modern derivative *Vintersolstand*, and Icelandic has *Sólstödur* the modern derivative *Vetrarsólstödur*.

In German the word *sonnwende* (solstice), though never used for solstice, is sometimes used for *equinox*, so that Germany can bo having three solstices, which she certainly deserves on account o ancient three seasons.[2] In Flanders the equinoxes are called *summe* (March 17) and *winter day* (September 21),[3] whilst in Frisian and E *summer day* means summer solstice. In Middle-High-German the translation of *equinox* (*ebennaht*) is very rare and very late, so th almost seems to have been borrowed from Frisian.[4] At any rate it was a popular date or an early term. It is not before the fift century that the equinox is used for dating documents, and even th

---

[1] Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung des deutschen Mittelalters*, 1891, I., p. 178.

[2] "Sonnwende der ander in der vasten," Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung*, 1891, I., Grotefend maintains the same usage to have existed among the Frisians, *Ibid.*, I. "A sunna ewenda bifara sente Liudgeris dei" (Richthofen, *Friesische Rechtsquellen*, but I should be rather inclined to think that we have there to do with Saturday i of equinox.

[3] Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung*, 1891, I., p. 178.

[4] "Der onager, in dem merzen an dem funf und zweinzigisten tage sô luot er zw unde sam ofte in der naht, davon bekennet man sint, daz ebennaht belouhtet ir sunn wæt ir wint," Karajan, 82, 26; Müller und Zarncke, *Mittelhochdeutsches Wört* Leipzig, 1863, I., 301. *Ibid.*, "Ebennahtec, equinoxialis obent-nehtig," Dief *Glossen.*, 109; "Equinoxium, ebennachtig," *Ibid.*; "aequinoctium ewennachtig," VIII., 249.

is supplemented by other things.[1] The complicated expression *Tag und Nachtgleiche*, which bears the stamp of artificial manufacture, is of quite modern origin. Frisian and English evolve a little earlier than German their common term for equinox, A.S. *evenniht* or *emnihte*,[2] Frisian *evennaht*.[3] Among the Northern Germanics the term is exceedingly rare and very late. Modern Icelandic has *jafn-dægur* and *jafn-dægri*, equal days; Modern Danish has *jævndogn*; Modern Norwegian has *jafndægri*, *jevndogn*, and *jafnnætti*.

If we knew nothing about the actual division of the Germanic year, it would, on the authority of these philological facts, be safe to assume that the ancient Germanics did not base their seasons and tides on solstices and equinoxes. There was once a theory current according to which everything—myth, cult, custom—was traced back to an alleged sun worship or observations of the events visible in the sky, such as the rising of the sun, the hiding of the sun behind clouds, and the shifting of the rising-point of the sun on the horizon. But, as regards Germanic tribes, that theory is so little applicable as to make it quite certain that among our ancestors the sun was no deity. We have not only absolutely no traces of sun worship among the Germanic nations, but even in historical times the sun has been of different gender in different Germanic languages. Nay, different Germanic tribes even had different words for *sun*, which, though coming from the same root, were formed with different suffixes (Gothic *sunnô*, fem., and *sunna*, masc.; German *Sonne*, fem.; English *sun*, masc.; Gothic *sauil*, neut.; Anglo-Saxon *sôl*; Old Scandinavian *sôl*). As to deities, the Germanics seem to have originally had one god only, his name being **Tîwaz* (Greek Ζεύς, Latin *Dies-piter*), to whom in common Germanic times another was added, named **Thonaraz*, whilst North Germany still later pro-

[1] "1402 als equenoxium was umme sunte Gregorius dge uten" (*Magdeburger Schöppenchronik*, 304), Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung*, 1898, II., 2, 194.

[2] Thomas Wright, *Popular Treatises on Science*, London, 1841, pp. 8, 9, "Ver is lencten-tid, seo hæfdh emnihte; autumnus is hærfest, the hæfdh odhre emnihte," *Saxon Chronicle*, Laud MS., E, 1048; "to hærfestes emnihte," John Earle, *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, Oxford, 1865, pp. 179, 180.

[3] Richthofen, *Friesische Rechtsquellen*, 390-392. "Letera evennaht" is the September equinox, Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung*, I., 54.

duced a third,* *Wodanaz*, who in the Middle Ages immigrated to Scandinavia, but never won the adoration of the High-German tribes. Besides, there was one goddess, called *Frija*. At any rate we may affirm that at the time when, probably in the first century of our era, the Germans took over from the Romans the Phœnician week of seven days, and replaced their names by German terms which corresponded exactly to the Roman terms, there was not even a god to take the place of *Saturnus*.

Whilst the summer solstice was probably taken over directly from popular Roman tradition, the equinoxes seem to have become familiar to the clerical Germanic mind through the bearing the spring equinox had on the fixing of Easter, the more so because violent discussions about the proper time for holding Easter were going on for several centuries, and most seriously affected the Anglican Church. It is in connection with this controversy that we get our first information about our ancestors' ability to find the term of the spring equinox. Ceolfrid's Letter on Easter and the Tonsure, written circa A.D. 710,[1] shows that about that time the capacity to fix the date of the equinoxes by observation had been attained in Great Britain, though several centuries elapsed after their first acquaintance with them before equinoxes and solstices were accepted as terms quartering a solar year of 365 days and a quarter. It was probably not before the eleventh century that this took place. The Anglo-Saxon treatise of astronomy, which is entirely based on Beda's *De Temporum Ratione*[2] and on Roman views, calls the four Roman quarters of the year, which are halved by solstices and equinoxes, *lencten-tid*, *sumor*, *hærfest*, and *winter*, of which *lencten-tid*, by its very name a compound with *tide*, is shown to be not an old term.

---

[1] Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, Oxford, 1871, III., 289: "Aequinoctium autem, juxta sententiam omnium Orientalium, et maxime Aegyptiorum, qui prae ceteris doctoribus calculandi palmam tenent, duodecimo kalendarium Aprilium die provenire consuevit, ut etiam ipsi horologica inspectione probamus."

[2] Historical Society of Science, *Popular Treatises on Science* written during the Middle Ages, ed. by Thomas Wright, London, 1841, pp. 8, 9: "Feower tida synd ge-tealde on anum geare, that synd, ver, æstas, autumnus, hiems. Ver is lencten-tid, seo hæfdh emnihte; æstas is sumor, se hæfdh sunn-stede; autumnus is hærfest, the hæfdh odhre emnihte; hiems is winter, se hæfdh otherne sunnstede."

Notwithstanding all these facts, Professor Weinhold goes on talking about Germanic solstices and equinoxes as if nothing in the world were a fact better established. After having wrongly fixed the terms of the dual division of the year at the end of September and of March, and two of the terms of the three-fold partition on almost the same days, he proceeds[1] to declare that the Germanics halved their two seasons, summer and winter, and thus arrived, absolutely like the Romans, at four seasons (which, however, were no longer seasons, but broke entirely through the system of actual seasons). In his fanciful way he sets down the following bold guesses:[2] "Midwinter and midsummer, Christmas and the feast of John Baptist, according to ecclesiastical denomination, stand out in the German year as very ancient high tides. Through the standing still of the sun, which, according to the opinion of that time, stopped in turning round to a new journey, the people felt themselves driven to solemn rest and the service of the deity of the sky which led the sun. Divination and prophecy prevailed during those tides, and with their mysterious thrill interrupted the noisy joy which wreathed round heathen sacrifices." Yet there is not a shadow of historical evidence for these fancies. The Germanics neither had a festival about Christmas nor about the day of John Baptist. The Twelve-nights, of which he talks a little further on, are simply the Dodekahemeron of the old Church, which existed there for centuries before they appeared among any Germanic tribe.[3] Nay, all through the Middle Ages the term *Sonnenwende*, or solstice, has not a single time been shown to have been applied to December 25: its use is absolutely restricted to June 24, just as the word *solsticium* was among the Romans. If Weinhold[4] places the Anglo-Saxon word *lîdha* for June and July alongside the Dutch *lauwe*, *louwmænt* for January, explains them as *lind* and *lau*, transforms these meanings to "resting," and refers that adjective to the "rest of the sun," which, according to popular belief, *i.e.*, according to his belief, took place about midwinter and midsummer, one may well be doubtful whether that serves to strengthen the position of his own hypothesis. The

[1] *Deutsche Jahrteilung*, p. 9. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[3] Compare my own book *Geschichte der deutschen Weihnacht*, Leipzig, 1893, p. 282.
[4] *Deutsche Jahrteilung*, p. 14.

goddesses *Ostara* and *Hrêda*, on whom he[1] lays much stress, he has later given up himself. But he still deduces from the facts that the Scandinavians divided their year by October 9 to 14 and April 9 to 14 (*vetrnâtt* and *sumarnâtt*), and that the Germans are shown to have had the Roman seasons, one of which began about October 1, the conclusion that equinoxes, of which the Germanics knew absolutely nothing, "divided the most ancient German year."[2]

In his *Weihnacht-Spiele und Lieder aus Süddeutschland und Schlesien*[3] there is even a chapter headed in the index as "The Germanico-heathen celebration of the winter solstice," in which he gives a still more enrapturing delineation of that alleged Germanic festival, without being in the least disturbed by the fact that such a thing never existed. There even the error occurs, that the solstice had been called *Jul*, accompanied by another, that the winter solstice was the beginning of the Germanic year. We learn that that time was devoted to Wodan, and Fricke, or Holda, or Berchta or Hera, or Gode; that the boar (*bār*) led about through the village was not a boar at all, but a bear; that it was not the central figure of the procession, but probably merely accidental: and we have a hundred other products of unscientific imagination. The description given of the holy Twelve-nights of the Germanics[4] is almost touching. That the Christmas fires have a close relation to the sun; that *yule* has etymologically to do with *wheel*; that the Christmas tree is to be derived from Wodan; that a great number of the customs in use from Martinmas to Easter should properly be held on Christmas eve, or, at least, on the Twelve-nights; these and an extensive list of other most surprising fancies can be learned from that book. So the whole of the thirty-six pages which Professor Weinhold's disciple, Dr. Ulrich Jahn, in his book *Die deutschen Opfergebräuche bei Ackerbau und Viehzucht*,[5] devotes to the offerings about the time of the winter solstice, contain, in so far as they are meant to apply to pre-Christian times, nothing but unhistorical speculations, and would have been better omitted from that book, which, in various respects, may be called

---

[1] Weinhold, *Deutsche Jahrteilung*, 1862, p. 15. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 6.
[3] Wien, 1875, pp. 4, ss. [4] Given *Ibid.*, p. 11. [5] Breslau, 1884, pp. 253-289.

useful, and certainly represents a much more critical attitude on the part of its author than any of the attempts of Professor Weinhold to deal with the problems of German popular tradition.

IV.—THE CALENDS OF JANUARY.

In the first century before Christ a number of Germanic tribes, through commerce and war, came into close contact with the Romans, taking over from them in rapid succession the Roman capital alphabet of Egyptian origin to turn it into their runes, the Phœnicio-Roman week, the pre-Julian calendar with its beginning of the year on March 1, some astronomical wisdom, and a variety of other things. They took over the institution of the ancient Roman leap year with its intercalary month,[1] although they did not add this *mensis Mercidonius* every second year between February 23 and 24, but about the middle of summer and at intervals which we do not know. This intercalary period of apparently about thirty days was the first thing to interfere with the congruity of the German year, which, so far, had known only tides of sixty days, but had not taken account of lunar periods for the purpose of dividing time, however conscientiously they might observe them as bringing good or bad luck to the affairs of daily life. Tacitus[2] keeps that usage quite distinct from the Germanic division of the year. So it continued for at least three-quarters of a millennium.[3] The introduction of Roman months instead of tides of about

---

[1] We know this from Beda, *De Temporum Ratione*, chap. xv., who expressly testifies to the existence of an intercalary month among the ancient Angles.

[2] *Germania*, chap. xi.: "Coeunt nisi quid fortuitum et subitum incidit, certis diebus, cum aut inchoatur luna aut impletur; nam agendis rebus hoc auspicatissimum initium credunt."

[3] *Acta Conciliorum*, Parisiis, 1714, Vol. III., col. 1686; *Concilium Quinisextum sive in Trullo*, A.D. 706, lxv.: "Qui in noviluniis a quibusdam ante suas officinas et domos accenduntur rogos, supra quos etiam antiqua quadam consuetudine salire inepte ac delire solent, iubemus deinceps cessare. Quisquis ergo tale quid fecerit, si sit quidem clericus, deponatur: sin autem laicus, segregetur."

sixty days necessarily led to a breaking up of the latter into two
equal length, for which new names were required. The fact that
Germanic tides which formed the course of a year began about th
of the Roman months made things a little difficult. Yet the Roma
names were taken over and bye and bye replaced by new Germa
which were formed by means of a word probably identical with (
moon, *mânôdh*, (Gothic *mênôths*, Old Saxon *mônadh*). It is, however,
whether Latin *mensis* is exactly of the same derivation. Similarly, th
of the root of *moon* to Sanskrit *mâ*, to measure (Greek *μέτρον*), is
with good reason. The moon was, among the Aryans and an
Germanics in particular, anything but the medium for dividing th
of the year, for which they received, at a very early date, a rea
theory of probably Egyptian origin. The word *mânôdh* was added
of the sections in order to mark them clearly out from the old three-
tides, the names of which were used for forming the new compou
the old *Iiuleis* tide of sixty days at the beginning of winter was
into a first *Iiuleis* month and a second *Iiuleis* month, the *Lida*
summer into a first *Lida* month and a second *Lida* month, to w
intercalary years, a third *Lida* month was appended, whilst th
Iiuleis, *Lida*, etc., without any addition, continued to mean a tide
sixty days, two of which formed a Germanic season of a long hu
days. Only gradually self-dependent names were developed for th
tides which were denoted months, most of these names being tak
economic life, which naturally varied considerably between the c
the Baltic and the south of France, and from the British Isles
the coasts of the Adriatic,[1] and remained an ever new source c
giving, especially during the time of transition from prevalent pa
prevalent agriculture. The inexhaustible variety of circumstances w
to names for these new half-tides made impossible the developmen
and the same series of home-made month-names for all Germanic t
even for each of the principal groups of them; nay, for individu
The several hundreds of Germanic month-names found on Germanic

[1] Weinhold, *Die deutschen Monatnamen*, Halle, 1869, pp. 24-28.

from the sixth century down to the present time, with their innumerable variations of meaning, make impossible of attainment a system which would embrace them all.

In the year of Rome 707, *i.e.*, forty-five years before the date from which later the Christian era was counted, the Julian calendar began to reign in Italy and Gaul, and on the coasts of the Mediterranean in general. Within the hundred and fifty years which followed, Roman legions and Roman administration carried it over the Rhine into Germany, and beyond the channel into the British Isles. As long as Gaul remained a Roman province entirely Romanized; as long as down the banks of the Rhine there flourished large Roman towns; as long as hundreds of thousands of Germans served in Roman armies, visiting Italy, Greece, Asia Minor, Egypt, fighting all over the world then known, and more than once disposing of the Roman imperial throne; as long as invading Goths went down to Italy and Vandilian invaders to the North of Africa without losing contact with those Germanic tribes which remained northward of the Alps—there was practically no limit to the entry of Roman knowledge into Germanic territory; and in the suite of every-day experience there came Roman learning with its poets, historians, philosophers, rhetoricians, scientists, and physicians. All along the Rhine there flourished Roman rhetoric schools in considerable number, in which the noble science of grammar and the *trivium* as well as the *quadrivium* were taught thoroughly. Among the Germanics there was no self-dependent scholarship that could successfully compete with those finest products of a higher civilization, and so it became, for about a thousand years, the task of the Germanics to receive and ever receive mental gifts from the civilization of the empire they destroyed.

In the suite of the new calendar which, after Julius Caesar, began the year with the Calends of January (at which date, subsequently to 153 B.C., the Roman consuls had entered their offices), the whole annual course of Roman festivals passed by degrees to Gaul, Germany, and the south of Great Britain; above all, the *Saturnalia*, *Brumalia*, and *Kalendae Januariae*, which, during the first three centuries of our era, were with great regularity observed in all the great towns along the Rhine, and thence spread to the

inner parts of Germany, as far as Bohemia; nay, even to the Slave tribes east of the Germans, and to the Lithuanians north of them.[1]

Since even Professor Weinhold admits that the Roman calendar was one of the three forces which shaped the medieval German calendar,[2] it will be worth while to see of what kind the Roman customs were which could be transferred to Germany along with the institution of the Calends of January and the neighbouring festivals. There was first of all the custom of New-Year's gifts or *Strenae*.[3] In imperial Rome the people and the Senate were expected to present New-Year's gifts to the emperors,[4] it being related that Augustus had had a nocturnal vision requiring that people should annually, on a certain day, present money to him, which he received with a hollow hand.[5] During his reign they were given on the Capitol; but Caligula was so lost to a sense of shame, as to publish an edict expressly requiring such gifts, and to stand in the porch of the palace, on the Calends of January, in order to receive those which people of all descriptions brought to him.[6] It was reckoned a handsome enough way of receiving gifts, when the bosom-

---

[1] The Lithuanians, according to the old significance of their winter festival, called many centuries later their Christmas *Kalledos*, a name which has wrongly been brought into connection with Lithuanian *Kalada*, log (Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, 4th ed., p. 522), but is certain to have sprung from *Calendae*, since the Czechic word for Christmas is up till to-day *Koleda* (Polish *Kolenda*, Russian *Koljada*); a fifteenth century source calling Bohemian Christmas processions *calendisationes* (Usener, *Christlicher Festbrauch*, Bonn, 1889; Johannes von Holleschau's *Treatise on Christmas*), and a verb *colendisare* appearing in old sources of Bohemian law (Rössler, *Prager Recht*, p. 95, No. 140). Compare my own *Geschichte der deutschen Weihnacht*, Leipzig, 1893, p. 287, note to p. 14,[3], where the quotations from Holleschau's treatise are given.

[2] *Uber deutsche Jahrteilung*, Kiel, 1862, p. 3.

[3] The habit of New-Year's presents *boni ominis causa* is first mentioned by Plautus (+ 184 B.C.) in his *Stichus*, iii. 2, 6; v. 2, 24. Their purpose is explained by Ovid, *Fasti*, i. 187. Cakes and fruits were the principal gifts (Martialis, viii. 33; xiii. 37; Seneca, *Epistulae*, lxxxvii,). It seems to have been under Augustus that money took the place of these eatables. The custom still prevailed about A.D. 400 under the Emperors Arcadius and Honorius.

[4] Suetonius, in *Augustus*, chap. lvii.; in *Tiberius*, chap. xxxiv.; in *Caligula*, chap. xlii. Compare Preller, *Römische Mythologie*, p. 161.

[5] "Cavam manum asses porrigentibus praebens," *Ibid.*, in *Augustus*, chap. xci.

[6] Suetonius, in *Caligula*, chap. xlii.

fold of the cloak was expanded; but, when they were received with both hands hollow,[1] or in "goupins," to use the Scotch word, it was accounted objectionable. Hence rapine was proverbially expressed in that manner.[2]

But the celebration of the Calends of January was by no means the only festivity of that time of the year in ancient Rome; there was a whole series of festivals, so that Seneca (+A.D. 39) could write to his friend Lucilius: "It is now the month of December, when the greatest part of the city is in a bustle. Loose reins are given to public dissipation; everywhere may you hear the sound of great preparations, as if there were some real difference between the days dedicated to Saturn and those for transacting business. Thus, I am disposed to think, that he was not far from the truth who said that anciently it was the month of December, but now the year. Were you here, I would willingly confer with you as to the plan of our conduct; whether we should live in our usual way, or, to avoid singularity, both take a better supper and throw off the toga. For what was not wont to be done, except in a tumult or during some public calamity to the city, is now done for the sake of pleasure, and from regard to the festival. Men change their dress. It were certainly far better to be thrifty and sober amidst a drunken crowd, disgorging what they had recently swallowed."[3]

These festivals were the *Saturnalia*, with their equality between rich and poor, freemen and slaves, and their presents of all descriptions,[4] lasting from December 17 to December 19; or seven days, from December 17 to December 23. All labour rested, and, under the call *Io Saturnalia! Io Saturnalia!* people gave themselves to a wild joy. Then followed the *Brumalia*, fixed by Caesar erroneously on December 25, the alleged shortest day of the year, called since that time occasionally *Dies Invicti Solis*, day of the unconquered sun. The character of *Saturnalia*, *Brumalia*, and

---

[1] "Utraque manu cavata."

[2] Ammianus Marcellinus, Lib. XVI.; Rosin, *Antiquitates*, p. 29.

[3] Seneca, *Epistulae*, xviii.; Jamieson, *Etym. Dict. of Scot. Lang.*, "Yule," IV.

[4] Cereos Saturnalibus muneri dabant humiliores potentioribus, quia candelis pauperes, locupletes cereis utebantur," Festus Pompeius, Lib. III.

Kalendae Januariae, was very wild and lascivious, so wild that, together with the *Matronalia* of the first of March (and sometimes with the *Septimontium*, the feast of incorporation of the seven hills with the city of Rome, also celebrated in December), they were, by the fathers of the Christian Church, regarded as a perfect essence of heathendom, which was by no means meant to be a compliment. So Tertullian (+A.D. 220) could say: "By us who are strangers to sabbaths and new moons, once acceptable to God, the *Saturnalia* and the feasts of January, and *Brumalia*, and *Matronalia*, are frequented; gifts are sent hither and thither; there is the noise of the *Strenae*, and of games and feasting. O! better faith of the nations in their own religions, which adopts no solemnity of the Christians."[1]

With the introduction of the Julian calendar all kinds of southern Calend rights found entrance to the Germanics: the making of processions through the streets and singing of songs, the lighting of candles and lamps, the adorning of their houses with laurel and green trees, the giving of presents, men dressing up in women's garments, masquerades in the hides of animals, and the erection of a table of fortune for the good luck of the new year.[2]

Half a century before the beginning of our era the first Roman legion had entered Great Britain, and not much later British soil was in constant occupation by Roman legions. The great mass of Roman inscriptions found

---

[1] Tertullian, *De Idolatria*, chap. xiv. These sweetmeats, called by the name of *Strenae*, were therefore prohibited by the early church (V. Rosin., *Antiquitates*, p. 29). The *Strenae* are traced as far back as to King Tatius, who at this season used to receive branches of a happy or fortunate tree from the grove of *Streniae* as favourable omens with respect to the new year. In another passage (*De Idolatria*, chap. x.) Tertullian says: "Saturnalia, strenae captandae, et septimontium, et brumae, et carae cognationis honoraria exigenda omnia." Compare also Tertullian's *De Fuga in Persecutione*, chap. xiii.

[2] *Acta Conciliorum*, Parisiis, 1714, Vol. III., col. 365; *Concilium Turonense*, II., A.D. 567, xxii.: "Enim vero quoniam cognovimus nonnullos inveniri sequipedas erroris antiqui, qui Kalendas Ianuarii colunt cum Ianus homo gentilis fuerit: rex quidem, sed Deus esse non potuit." And eight years later: "Non liceat iniquas observationes agere Kalendarum, et otiis vacare gentilibus, neque lauro aut viriditate arborum cingere domos. Omnis haec observatio paganismi est" (caput lxxiii. of the *Capitula Martini Episcopi Bracensis*, circa A.D. 575). *Ibid.*, Vol. III., col. 399.

in Britain gives ample evidence as to their sojourn there. It is not astonishing that among these we find one devoted to the "God The Unconquered Sun" (*Deus Invictus Sol*),[1] which further supports the general assumption that these legions did not only celebrate the Calends of January, but the *Brumalia* as well, and *a fortiori* the *Saturnalia*. The exact date when the Roman legions were withdrawn from Great Britain is not known, but there is no doubt that Roman civilization and Roman religious tradition survived them there, so that when Augustine and his Roman fellow-missionaries of Christianity landed in Britain (A.D. 592) they found there December 25 as a day marked in the festive calendar, at least of the south of England, which naturally paved the way for a celebration of Christ's Nativity on the same day.

As regards the continental Germanics, as late as the middle of the eighth century there existed a perfect unity of popular sacramental usage as to the Calends of January between them and the Romans, the German Calends rites not only resembling the Roman ones absolutely, but even being felt to be identical with them by the people celebrating them. We know this from an incident of A.D. 742. In that year, Winfrid (Bonifacius), the "apostle of the Germans," in a letter written to Pope Zacharias, complained of a strange fact which hindered his getting on better in sowing the gospel in the souls of the *Alamanni*, *Boioarii*, and *Franci*. For when he interdicted them from certain heathen customs, they justified themselves by the excuse that they had seen similar things at Rome, close to St. Peter's Church, where these things were regarded as perfectly permissible. And they told Boniface they had seen that every year on the eve of the

---

[1] *Monumenta Historica Britannica* in the chapter, "Ex Inscriptionibus Excerpta de Britannia," p. 116, No. 103: "Deo Invicto Soli Soc Sacrum Pro Salute Et Incolumitate Imp. Caes. M. Aureli Antonini Pii Felic. Aug. L. Caecilius Optatus Trib. Coh. I. Vardul Cum Con* braneis Votum. Deo * * A Solo Extruct * * *" (Riechester or Rochester, Northumberland). The Inscriptions, No. 102, "Deo Invicto Herculi Sacr. L. Aemil. Salvianus Trib. Coh. I. Vangi V.S. P.M." (Risingham, Northumberland), and No. 75, "Silvano Invicto Sacrum C. Tertius Veturius Micianus," etc., show, however, that *Invictus* was a rather general divine predicate, which excludes the possibility of interpreting Inscription No. 103 as dedicated to the sole unconquered God, taking *soli* as the dative singular of *solus*.

Calends of January, after heathen custom, processions went through the streets singing unchristian songs and using heathen exclamations, that people erected tables of fortune and kept a Calends fire from which they would not give anything away, just as they refused to lend anything else to their neighbours during that time, and that women went publicly about wearing amulets round arms and legs, and offered them to others for sale. The Pope could not deny that such things actually happened in Rome; but, of course, declared in his answer to Boniface that he detested them, as all Christians should do.[1] In the next year he brought the matter before the Synod of Rome, which promptly interdicted all usages of that kind at the Calends of January and *Brumalia*.[2] An interdiction which was for several centuries repeated and repeated again, was in the form of a question taken over into all more important Penitentials of the Church,

---

[1] *Acta Conciliorum*, Parisiis, 1714, Vol. III., col. 1880, *Epistola Bonifacii Episcopi ad Zachariam Papam* (741-752): V. "Quia carnales homines idiotae, Alamanni, vel Bajuarii, vel Franci, si juxta Romanam urbem aliquid fieri viderint ex his peccatis quae nos prohibemus, licitum et concessum a sacerdotibus esse putant: et dum nobis improperium deputant, sibi scandalum vitae accipiunt. VI. Sicut affirmant se vidisse annis singulis in Romana urbe, et juxta ecclesiam sancti Petri, in die vel nocte quando Kalendae Ianuarii intrant, paganorum consuetudine choros ducere per plateas, et acclamationes ritu gentilium, et cantationes sacrilegas celebrare, et mensas illa die vel nocte dapibus onerare, et nullum de domo sua vel ignem, vel ferramentum, vel aliquid commodi vicino suo praestare velle. Dicunt quoque se ibi vidisse mulieres pagano ritu phylacteria et ligaturas in brachiis et in cruribus ligatas habere, et publice ad vendendum venales ad comparandum aliis offerre. Quae omnia eo quod ibi a carnalibus et insipientibus videntur, nobis hic improperium et impedimentum praedicationis et doctrinae faciunt." To this the Pope replied (*Ibid.*, III., col. 1883, vi.): "De Kalendis vero Januariis, vel ceteris auguriis, vel phylacteriis, et incantationibus, vel aliis diversis observationibus, quae gentili more observari dixisti apud beatum Petrum apostolum, vel in urbe Roma; hoc et nobis, et omnibus Christianis detestabile et perniciosum esse judicamus," etc. The Letters are reprinted in *Epistolae Merowingici et Karolini aevi*, I., Berlin, 1892, p. 301, and commented upon by Rudolf Koegel, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters*, Strassburg, 1894, p. 29, though Koegel fails to recognize their proper bearings.

[2] *Acta Conciliorum*, Parisiis, 1714, Vol. III., col. 1929, *Concilium Romanum*, I., A.D. 743, ix.: "Ut nullus Kalendas Januarias et broma colere praesumpserit, aut mensas cum dapibus in domibus praeparare, aut per vicos et plateas cantationes et choros ducere, quod maxima iniquitas est coram Deo: anathema sit." Compare R. Koegel, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, I. 28.

and there probably lived longer than the usages of which it was meant to be destructive. The question was: "Didst thou observe the Calends of January after heathen custom, so as to lead singers and choirs through the streets and open places?"[1]

From the letter by Bonifacius to Pope Zacharius (741-752) it appears that, according to Roman custom, the fire at the Calends of January was regarded as holy, and custom did not permit anything to be taken away from it.[2] The Calends fire was an entirely private affair, not kept in public; a fire on the hearth of the home, not a bonfire; whilst all Germanic festive fires are bonfires in the open air.

There is not a single case on record of a New Year's or Christmas fire held in the open air in ancient times; when such fires are recorded, towards the end of the twelfth century, they are of a perfectly private character.[3] It can scarcely astonish anybody that, in the coldest time of the year, good care was taken to have a good warm fire, and that for that purpose large pieces of wood were put on, but a thorough proof would be requisite before such fires could be regarded as of Germanic origin. Besides, they are by no means confined to Christmas, but appear on Epiphany as

---

[1] "Observasti Calendas Ianuarias ritu paganorum . . . ita ut per vicos et per plateas cantores et choros duceres," Penitentiary of Burchard von Worms (Friedberg, *Aus deutschen Bussbüchern*, p. 84; Rud. Koegel, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, 1894, I., p. 29).

[2] *Acta Conciliorum*, Parisiis, 1714, Vol. III., col. 1880, *Epistola Bonifacii Episcopi ad Zachariam Papam*, vi., where it is said of the Calends of January: "Et nullum de domo suo vel ignem, vel ferramentum, vel aliquid commodi vicino suo praestare velle." At the *Saturnalia* candles were given as presents, nay, even torches of wax. "Cereos Saturnalibus muneri dabant humiliores potentioribus, quia candelis pauperes, locupletes cereis utebantur," Festus Pompeius, Lib. III. The same custom is witnessed by Martialis and Macrobius.

[3] The oldest case of a *quasi* public Christmas fire is found in 1591. Schröteler, *Herrlichkeit und Stadt Viersen*, Köln, 1861, pp. 349, 350, Article 32 of the *Viersener Landrecht* of 1591. But even that seems to have taken place in the private house of the provost: "Item wan ein donner wetter ist soll der scholtis den küster die klocken helffen trecken oder sein diener, desgleichen in der *Christnacht* so lang helffen trecken, dass ein man auss Theys hoff an die kirch gahn magh und in der selbe frube morgen stondt sall der scholtiss einen stock oder hartholtz ein grot feur in brandt halten bist der Gottesdienst auss ist, das die jenighe, so zur metten und zur kirchen kommen, sich etwas wermen mogen."

well. An old Bavarian manuscript contains the item: "*Ignes qui fieri solent in vigilia Epiphaniae.*"[1]

We know from a *Weistum* that (A.D. 1184) one of the privileges of the manse of Ahlen, Westphalia, was the right of delivery to it of a whole tree for the festive fire at Christmas eve. But that fire is at the same time denoted as the clergyman's private festive Christmas fire;[2] and in another *Weistum*, of Riol and Velle on the Mosella, the *Scheffe* is said to be entitled to a *Winnachtploech*;[3] whilst a third *Weistum*, of Tavern on the Mosella, remarks: "*Item ein bochg zu hawen vff Christabend vor den Christbraten*;"[4] so that we have no more to do with a festive fire, but merely with a fire for roasting meat in the kitchen, if there was one, and if the roasting was not rather done over the fire of the common room. There occur also public payments for a common *Christbraden* of burghers.[5]

That the festive fire at Christmas was a private affair, and that poor people were not always able to have one of their own, appears from a little medieval story, either from the thirteenth or fourteenth century, which contains an allusion to the Yule-log, although it seems to point to the fact that it was by no means common, so that a blacksmith could rejoice to get a Yule-log contrary to expectation, by a mere play of seeming chance.[6]

---

[1] Ulrich Jahn, *Deutsche Opfergebräuche*, 1884, p. 255.

[2] When stating the privileges of his parsonage the clergyman: "Et arborem in nativitate domini ad festivum ignem suum adducendum esse dicebat." Kindlinger, *Münstersche Beiträge*, II., document 34; Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, 2nd ed., p. 594.

[3] Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer*, II., 302.

[4] Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer*, II., 264.

[5] Town archiv of Bingen on the Rhine, No. 90. Town accounts of A.D. 1501, "Item 14 s. 6 hllr. hain wir geben zum Christbraden uff die christnacht den burgern und nachbern."

[6] "Quidam in partibus de Winchelse sibi aggregavit pecuniam in cista, de qua nec sibi nec aliis voluit subvenire. Veniens igitur una die ut eam videret, vidit super eam quendam diabolum sedere nigerrimum, dicentem sibi, 'Recedere, nec est pecunia tua, sed Godewini fabri.' Quod ille audiens, et nolens eam in alicujus commodum pervenire, cavavit magnum truncum, ipsamque imposuit, reclusit, et in mare projecit. Quem quidem truncum marinae undae ante ostium dicti Godewini, viri justi et innocentis, manentis in proxima villa, super litus in siccum projecerunt, circa vigilium Dominici Natalis. Exiens itaque idem Godwinus mane, invenit truncum projectum, multumque gavisus pro habendo foco in tanto festo, eum in domum suam traxit, et ad locum foci gaudens apposuit. Intrante itaque festi praedicti vigilia, ignis trunco supponitur, metallum intro latens liquescit, et exterius defunditur.

On British soil an early instance of a Yule-clog or Yule-log has yet to be given. Ulrich Jahn's generalizations,[1] according to which a pre-Christian winter-solstice fire would have to be supposed as a general custom, are void of any historical foundation, and merely represent fantastic speculations. Nay, the very fact that the British version of the above story[2] makes the blacksmith use the tree trunk as an anvil seems to indicate that the Yule-log is only a more modern intrusion into that story. For the fact that the figure of the blacksmith is kept in the German story shows that the anvil has been replaced by the Yule-log, and not *vice versa*.[3]

The privilege of cutting wood in the forest about Christmas appears also in Switzerland, where it is connected with a local legend. On December 27, 1375, the women of the Berne village Hetteswil are said to have surprised and slain the knightly army of the Count of Coucy. As a reward they received, from the Prior of the monastery, the privilege to go, on St. John's day at Christmas, with a hatchet into the forest of the monastery and cut as much wood for boiling their Christmas soup as they needed. But when it was found that the forest suffered too great damage, because the

---

Quod videns uxor dicti Godwini, ignem subtrahit, truncum movet et abscondit. Sicque ut dominus praedictae pecuniae victum quaereret hostiatim, dictusque faber de paupere fieret inopinate dives, devulgatur quia in vicinio quod miser ille pecuniam suam demersisset, cogitavit ergo uxor dicti Godwini quod eidem misero in aliquo cautius subveniret, cogitans dictam pecuniam fuisse suam, fecit uno die panem unum, et in eo XL. solidos abscondens dedit ei. Quem infortunatus ille accipiens piscatoribus super litus obviavit, panem eis pro uno denario vendidit, et recessit. Venientes itaque piscatores ad domum dicti Godwini, prout fuerunt assueti, dictum panem extrahunt et suis equis elargiri proponunt. Quem agnoscens domina domus, avenam pro eis dedit et eum recepit. Idemque miser finetenus pauper undique remansit," Thomas Wright, *A Selection of Latin Stories* (from Manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: a Contribution to the History of Fiction during the Middle Ages. London, printed for the Percy Society, 1842), pp. 220, 221, from *Altdeutsche Blätter*, Vol. I., p. 75.

[1] *Die deutschen Opfergebräuche bei Ackerbau und Viehsucht*, Breslau, 1884, p. 258.

[2] Thomas Wright, *A Selection of Latin Stories*, p. 27, No. 25.

[3] The passage of the English story runs: "Dixit quidam puer ad magistrum navis, 'Da mihi truncum istum, quia faber istius villae amicus meus est, et volo ei dare truncum ut faciat sibe exinde incudem.' Et magister concessit. Cum autem faber quadam die operaretur super truncum illum et feriret, exilierunt denarii de trunco per quoddam foramen, et obstupuit faber, sed omnes collegit, et consilio uxoris suae illos abscondit."

women used to boil too tough Christmas fowl, the privilege was changed to the effect that instead of the firewood they received a meadow, which, in 1826, was still in the possession of the women of Hetteswil, and the yearly yield of which was spent for a meal called the fowl-soup.[1] That we have here to do with an old term servitude is evident from the fact that in some cases the servitude of driving a cart-load, or several cart-loads, of wood to a castle or landlord's dwelling, known to medieval Latinity as *truncagium*, and in early English as *wodlade*,[2] appears not at Christmas alone, but at Christmas and May, whilst the old terms were Martinmas and mid-May (or Rogation Days or Pentecost), of which the former had been shifted to Christmas.[3]

So late as about 1712 the wood for the Christmas fire is mentioned, it being a servitude of the holders to drive it into the castle.[4]

When the tenant of a small holding paid his duties at the old terms,

---

[1] *Berner Neujahrsblatt*, 1826, 28; Rochholz, *Deutscher Glaube und Brauch*, Berlin, 1867, II., p. 317.

[2] *Notes and Queries*, 7th series, x., 472, 1890, *Geo. Neilson: Truncagium.*

[3] Bürgermeisteramt Osterath, district Crefeld, *Schatzregister des Kirspels Osteraht*, made in 1683, after models of 1603 and 1640, contains the regulation that the community has the duty to drive to the castle of Linn twelve cart-loads of wood every eight weeks: "Item noch jahrligs drey Christ- und drey Meyfuhren beyfahren." In the sixteenth century Christmas and Pentecost (instead of Martinmas and Pentecost) appear together in the same way (Klotz, *Beschreibung der Herrschaft und Stadt Gera*, 1816, p. 237; the first article of the *Reussische Kirchenvisitation* of 1533 is: "Zu gedenken das Opfer-Geld zu Besserung des Pfarrers jährlich auf zwo Tagzeit, als nämlich zu Weyhnachten und Pfingsten ordentlich einzubringen und zusammlen").

The Archive of the Protestant parish of Leuscheid, Rhine country, contains, under IV. *b*[1], a complaint about the withdrawal of the Christmas allowance of wood of November 17, 1696. According to it, it was customary, "dass ein jedweder kirspels eingesessener, der welcher ein gefähr unter henden hat, auff *christmess* umbtrent ein karrich hotz, dass Christ-holtz, zu unterhaltung der hauss-steur an dass widem hauss unentgeltlich zu liefferen schuldig."

[4] Bürgermeisteramt Liedberg, district München Gladbach, *Acts*, No. 16, 4, Manuscript of about 1712, fragment of a Weistum on the services to be rendered to the family of Liedberg, paragraph 10, "Item ist auch das gantze amt nach advenant schuldig auf Christmessen die corstbrende dem haus Liedberg aufzufahren" (*advenant* is the document which regulates the distribution among the several communities of the servitudes to be borne by the whole district).

he was, as a rule, entertained to dinner by his landlord. The meal he got was not a free gift of the landlord, but something to which the tenant had a claim, and which had to be of a certain substantiality and duration. Its duration was, in the fifteenth century, fixed by the time requisite for burning away a wet wheel on the open fire in the hall in which the meal took place. We know that custom to have been observed at various terms, in autumn as in winter.[1] As long as the only instance known fell on December 26, there was at least some possibility of connecting this habit with the calends-log and later Christmas-log, but now this no longer holds good. Speculative mythologists found in that wheel an image of the sun, and regarded its burning as a solstice-celebration. In all probability the holders had to deliver the wheels—of course simple tree sections—and the time requisite for burning them was made the duration of their meal, in order that they might not make them too thin.

[1] In an unprinted document on the privileges of the family of Lüftelberg in the Sürst, a district between Bonn and Euskirchen, Rhine country, of 1579, which is copied from the same original as is an eighteenth century manuscript in the Archive of the family of Lüftelberg, it is decreed that the holders have to deliver their duties to the landlord on St. Kunibert's day (October 10): "Wann solches geschehen, so soll der grundherr darentgegen schuldig sein den geschwornen ein frei kost zugeben, drei gericht von einem schwein, erbsen und pfeffer, weck und brod, wein und bier, wie von alters gebrauchlich. Wann die geschwornen ihre zeit sitzen, so soll man ein rad an das feur legen, welches 3 tag und 6 wochen im wasser gelegen hat, so lang den geschwornen essen und trinken geben, bis ein auswendiger mann komt und nicht erkennen mag, was das gewesen sei" (communicated to me by Dr. Armin Tille of Bonn). It was the custom that the peculiarities of such dinners as were legal institutions should be prescribed exactly. Compare Lamprecht, *Deutsches Wirtschaftsleben im Mittelalter*, III., p. 32, Urbary of the Stift St. Trond of A.D. 1274 (Bridal on the Mosella); "Item autumpno facto debent praedicti feodales habere servitium sive prandium de tribus ferculis ab ecclesia sancti Trudonis, olera cum carnibus bovinis, carnes porcinas cum pipere et porcinas carnes assas." Another example of this custom was published by Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer*, II., p. 615, 616, 693: "Uff sant stephans tage solle der lehenmann liefern vnd bezalen pfenningzins vnd weissbroit, dan soll man dem lehenman guitlich thuin auff dem hofe, zweyerley wein zweyerley fleischs, zweyerley brot vnd alles desjeniges, wass vom tage zeitig iss. abe der lehenher bedoecht, dass der lehenman zu lange seess, so solle der lehenher ein naeff sechs wochen vnd drey tag in ein mistphole legen laissen, dieselb nit rödeln noch stochen, vnd wannehe die verbrandt, dass der dauon keyner mehr erkandt möcht werden, soll der lehenman vffstehen." A broad section of a tree still often forms the Scottish peet barrow wheel.

The custom of Christmas fire no doubt has its root in the Roman Calends of January rite of the same description. But that fact did not hinder it from receiving an intrinsically Christian interpretation. It was an old institute for the landlord to give his tenant a cart-load or wheelbarrow-load of wood at the birth of a child. Christ being regarded, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as a kind of little universal brother to mankind, the occasion of his birth was taken as an opportunity for gifts similar to those which children received at the birth of a baby brother or sister. In the beginning of the sixteenth century such gifts to children were called in North Germany *kindsvôt*, or child's-foot,[1] the same name being given to the present of straw which the cattle, swine, geese, and ducks received that day, in order that they might take part in the rejoicing over Christ's birth. Similarly it was a custom that, at Hippetsweiler, the *Kelner* gave to the small holders at Christmas three cart-loads of wood, and one cart-load on the birth of a child.[2] The *Gotteshausleute* of the monastery of Petershausen, Schlatt, in the first half of the fifteenth century, received at Christmas a wheelbarrow-load of wood—on the birth of a boy a cart-load, and on the birth of a girl a wheelbarrow-load of wood.[3]

There is another Italian custom connected with the Calends of January which found its way through Gaul to Great Britain and Germany, though comparatively late. It is the habit of walking about in the hides of calves and deer and doing all kinds of indecency under the protection of these masks. Even Rudolph Koegel, who has a great inclination for finding something Germanic everywhere, admits this custom to be of Italian origin.[4]

---

[1] Franz Wessel's description of the Roman Catholic service at Stralsund, A.D. 1523, Höfer in Bartsch's *Germania*, xviii., 1: "sô drôgen sê garuen in de koppele efte sus in de lucht, dadt se de windt snê rîp efte sus de lucht beschînen konde, dadt hêtede men des morgens kindesvôdt, dadt deelde men des morgen allem ûtth, schlôch eine garue 2 efte 3 ûth undt gaf den swînen koyen enten gensen dad se alle des kindesvôthes genêten scholdenn."

[2] Weistum of A.D. 1400, from Hippetsweiler, Upper Rhine, *Fürstenbergisches Urkundenbuch*, Tübingen, 1877, Vol. VI., No. 132, p. 216.

[3] A.D. 1444, *Ibid.*, Vol. VI., No. 240, Hössler, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Bauernkrieges in Südwestdeutschland*, Leipzig Dissertation, 1895, pp. 25, 26.

[4] *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, Strassburg, 1894, I., p. 30.

That this habit was unknown in inner Germany comparatively late can be shown by a misunderstanding made by a glossator when translating a passage relating to it.[1] There was a German custom to sit down on a cow's hide, or deer's hide, at a cross road, or on the roof of the house, on certain nights and wait for oracles. This was called *liodorsâza*. When the glossator found the phrase *in cervulo* mentioned, he thought it to refer to that custom, and translated: *in cervulo, in liodersâza*, whilst *in vetula* he interpreted *in deru varentun truchti, i.e.*, in the procession.[2] About these masquerades, which are till very late associated with the Calends, and have for a long time no relation to the Church festival of Christ's Nativity, we have various reports, the most important being the homily *De Sacrilegiis*, written in Gaul in the seventh or eighth century, but commonly ascribed to Augustine.[3] "Reversing the order of things, the heathens in those days dress themselves up into indecent monsters. These miserable men and, still worse, some baptized Christians, take on false likenesses and monstrous faces, of which people should rather be ashamed and sad. For what reasonable man would believe that men in the possession of their senses should, by playing a stag, turn themselves into the nature of animals? Others dress

---

[1] *Althochdeutsche Glossen.*, II., 365, 17.

[2] Koegel, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, I., 30, note, explains *in deru varentun truchti* quite rightly as procession, while Müllenhoff, *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, XII., 351, thought it to refer to the Wild Huntsman, who, however, is in no way connected with the Twelve-nights, as Koegel assumes, these Twelve-nights themselves being of Christian origin, the *Dodekahemeron* of the old Church.

[3] Ed. by Caspari, Christiania, 1886, who gives a large number of parallels to the customs related and expressions used. Compare Friedrich Panzer, *Bayerische Sagen und Bräuche München*, 1855, Vol. II., pp. 466-468: "Cervulum seu vitulam facere." Caspari's text says about the Calends of January, § 24: "In istis diebus miseri homines cervolo facientes vestiuntur pellibus pecodum. Alii sumunt capita bestiarum, gaudentes et exultantes ut homines non essent. Et illud quid turpe est! Viri tunicis mulierum induentes se feminas videri volunt." The usual phrases are: "cervulum et vetulam facere; in cervulo aut vetula vadere; cervulos aut vetulas ducere." Koegel, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, I., 30, note. The Council of Auxerre, 573-603 (in *Concilia aevi Merovingici*, ed. by Frid. Maassen, Hannover, 1893, p. 179) forbade: "Non licet Kalendis Januarii vetolo aut cervolo facere vel streneas diabolicas observare, sed in ipsa die sic omnia beneficia tribuantur sicut et reliquis diebus" (*Acta Conciliorum*, Parisiis, 1714, Vol. III., col. 444).

themselves up in the hides of their cattle; others put on the heads of animals, rejoicing and exulting that they are turned into the shape of beast to such an extent that they no more appear to be human beings. How horrible is it, further, that those who have been born men take on women's dresses, and effeminate their manhood by girls' dresses in an abominable masquerade! They who do not blush to put their warlike arms into women's dresses! Bearded faces are displayed by them, and yet they wish to be taken for women!" "What is so insane as, by a disgraceful dress, to give the male sex the appearance of the female? What so insane as to spoil one's face and put on masks by which even demons might be terrified? What so insane as with indecent gestures and improper songs to sing the praise of vices in shameless delight? To turn one's self into a wild beast, to resemble the goat or the stag, in order that man, created to be the likeness and image of God, may become the sacrifice of demons!" "Therefore he who gives to anyone of those miserable men in the Calends of January, when in the sacrilegious rite they rather rage than play, any human requirement shall know that he does not give it to men but to demons. Therefore, if you do not want to participate in their sins, do not permit that the stag or the cow or any such portent come before your house."[1] It almost looks as if the *Matronalia* of March 1, the lascivious festival of the ladies of ancient Rome, had, with the beginning of the year through the Julian calendar, been shifted to January 1, and there revived in ever-new glory and licentiousness! In less eloquent speech the same habit was repeatedly forbidden by councils and mentioned in Penitentials, especially during the eighth century.[2]

---

[1] A list of other allusions to this custom is given in my *Geschichte der deutschen Weihnacht*, pp. 15 and 288.

[2] Kalendas quae dicuntur, et vota, et brumalia quae vocantur; et qui in primo Martii mensis die fit conventum, ex fidelium universitate omnino tolli volumus: sed et publicas mulierum saltationes multam noxam exitiumque afferentes: quin etiam eas, quae nomine eorum, qui falso apud Gentiles dii nominati sunt; vel nomine virorum ac mulierum fiunt, saltationes ac mysteria, more antiquo et a vita Christianorum alieno, amandamus et expellimus; statuentes, ut nullus vir deinceps muliebri veste induatur, vel mulier veste viro conveniente. Sed neque comicas, vel satyricas, vel tragicas personas induat; neque execrandi Bacchi nomen, uvam in torcularibus exprimentes, invocent; neque vinum in

When, through the Julian calendar, the Calends of January became a festive tide among the Germanics, they were at first probably a festive tide like others, without any special reference to the new year. But in the course of time that side was bound to come into the fore ground, and to rival and, later on, to replace the old Germanic New Year towards the middle of November. So it could not fail that Germanic usages having special reference to the beginning of the year should bye and bye be transferred to the Calends of January, where we find them in the eighth and in the eleventh centuries.[1] The passage has for the first time been satisfactorily explained by Koegel in his *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*.[2] At New Year's eve people girt with their swords sat down on the roofs of their houses to find out what good and bad things would be brought by the new year. Others sat down at a cross road on a cow-hide. As was mentioned before, this was called *liodorsâza* or sitting down for the purpose of receiving an oracle, whilst the person who did so was called *hleotharsâzzo*

---

dolis effundentes, risum moveant; ignorantia vel vanitate, ea quae ab insaniae impostura procedunt, exercentes" (*Acta Conciliorum*, Parisiis, 1714, Vol. III., col. 1683, *Concilium Quinisextum sivi in Trullo*, A.D. 706, lxii.). The same appears in England: Thorpe, *Ancient Laws*, II., 34 (xxvii. "De Idolatria et Sacrilegio, et qui . . . in Kalendas Januarii in cervulo et in vitula vadit," etc.), § 19, "Si quis in Kalendas Ianuarii in cervulo aut vetula vadit, id est, in ferarum habitus se communicant, et vestiuntur pellibus pecudum, et assumunt capita bestiarum; qui vero taliter in ferinas species se transformant, III. annos poeniteant; quia hoc daemoniacum est" (seventh century) . . . § 24, "Qui observat divinos, vel praecantatores, philacteria etiam diabolica, et somnia, vel herbas; aut V. feriam, honore Iovis, vel kalendas Ianuarii, more paganorum, honorat; si clericus est, V. annos poeniteat; laicus III. annos poeniteat." Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, Oxford, 1871, Vol. III., p. 424; Egbert's *Penitential*, A.D. 732-766, viii. 4: "Caraios et divinos praecantatores, filecteria etiam diabolica vel herbas vel facino suis vel sibi impendere vel quinta feria in honore Jovis vel Kalendas Januarias secundum paganam causam honorare, si non, quinque annos peniteat clericus, si laicus, tres annos peniteat."

[1] To a custom like that refers the following (*Acta Conciliorum*, Parisiis, 1714, Vol. III., col. 1863, *Gregorii Papae II. Capitulare* (circa A.D. 720), ix.): "Ut incantationes, et fastidiationes, sive diversae observationes dierum Kalendarum, quas error tradidit paganorum, prohibeantur, sicut maleficia, et magorum praestigia, seu etiam sortilegium, ac divinantium observatio execranda." Burchard von Worms in Friedberg, *Aus deutschen Bussbüchern*, p. 84: "Vel in bivio sedisti supra taurinam cutem, ut et ibi futura tibi intelligeres?"

[2] Vol. I., p. 29.

(Keronic Glossary) or *hleodarsisseo* (Hrabanic Glossary), which was thought to correspond to Latin *negromanticus*.[1] But this habit was not confined to the Calends of January, probably appearing at all holy tides, and certainly at the time of the waning of the moon, nor were oracles the only purpose of it, as it was resorted to for the cure of fever and probably of other illnesses. So say the sentences of Pope Gregory III. (731-741),[2] in which, among others, Janus is referred to as the god in whose honour the *liodorsâza* is done.

Other kinds of prophecy were by the observation of the moon,[3] of the months, and of the effective potency of the several hours. Even the Church could not, in the long run, keep apart from the celebration of Calends. An ecclesiastical observance at the Calends existed at least in the middle of the ninth century.[4] At the Councils of Oxford, A.D. 1222, and of Lyon, 1244, the Calends of January were, as *Circumcisio Domini*, proclaimed a general festive day to be strictly kept by the Church. Johannes von Holleschau[5] speaks in 1426 of *calendisationes* in a little treatise on Christmas called *Largum Sero* or *Liberal Evening*, which is a slight modification of a booklet written by a priest, Alsso,

---

[1] *Althochdeutsche Glossen.*, I., 215, 33; II., 763, 9; II., 365, 35.

[2] *Acta Conciliorum*, Parisiis, 1714, Vol. III., col. 1875, *Gregorii Papae III. Judicia*, xxiii.: "Si quis maleficus aut malefica filium suum aut filiam supra tectum aut in fornace pro sanitate febrium posuerit, vel quando luna obscuratur; vel clamoribus suis, vel maleficiis sacrilego usu se defensare posse confidunt, vel ut frater in honore Jovis vel Beli aut Iani, secundum paganam consuetudinem, honorare praesumpserit, placuit secundum antiquam constitutionem sex annos poeniteant. Humanius tres annos judicaverunt."

[3] *Acta Conciliorum*, Parisiis, 1714, Vol. VI., 1., col. 207, *Synodus Generalis Rodomi* (circa A.D. 878), xiii.: "Si quis in Kalendis Ianuariis aliquid fecerit, quod a Paganis inventum est, et dies observat, et lunam, et menses; et horarum effectiva potentia aliquid sperat in melius aut in deterius verti, anathema sit."

[4] *Acta Conciliorum*, Parisiis, 1714, Vol. V., col. 394, *Hincmari Remensis Capitula*, A.D. 852, xv.: "Ut quando presbyteri per Kalendas simul convenerint, post peractum divinum mysterium, et necessariam collationem, non quasi ad prandium ibi ad tabulam resideant, et per tales in convenientes pastellos se invicem gravent, quia inhonestum est, et onerosum. Saepe enim tarde ad ecclesias suas redeuntes majus damnum de reprehensione conquirunt, et de gravedine mutua contrahunt, quam lucrum ibi faciunt."

[5] Usener, *Christlicher Festbrauch*, Bonn, 1889, p. 72.

about A.D. 1400. Alsso even tells us more.[1] At the beginning of every month the Bohemians carried about the image of their god Bel, singing a Czechic song. They rejoiced in the god thus visiting their houses, hoping faithfully that, in consequence, the whole month long he would send them good luck, and lead all their fortune and life. Therefore people brought gifts to the image of Bel, as it were a tribute, regarding themselves as his true worshippers in order that he might bring them luck. But St. Adalbert, because it was too circumstantial to do so at the beginning of every month, and in order that the Christians might not also celebrate the beginning of the months according to heathen custom, changed this celebration of the beginnings of months into a celebration of Christ's Nativity and of the week following it, thinking that it would be better to exercise that habit in the time in which Christ was born, than at the beginning of months, at which honour had once been bestowed upon Bel. He also is said to have altered the name and the sense of that celebration, making of *kalendisare colendisare* (from *colere*, to revere), because through that usage Christ was revered at his birthday, and not in the Calends. If this report does not imply that medieval Christmas in South Germany took the place of an older Calends celebration according to Roman usage, I do not know what it implies. The confusion in which the minds of both authors are is best shown by the fact that they not only regard the Calends rites as an imitation and distortion of Christmas rites caused by the devil, but at the same time inform us that up to St. Adalbert's time the Calends alone prevailed, and that it was this Saint who transferred to Christmas the *Calendisationes* or Calends processions,—two statements which are mutually exclusive.[2]

When the Chapters of Bishop Martin of Bracae, A.D. 575,[3] forbade the faithful to observe dangerous Calends customs, to keep the heathen times

---

[1] Usener, *Christlicher Festbrauch*, Bonn, 1889, p. 63.

[2] Usener, *Ibid.*, p. 63.

[3] *Acta Conciliorum*, Parisiis, 1714, Vol. III., col. 399, *Capitula Martini Episcopi Bracensis* (circa A.D. 575), chap. lxxiii.: "Non liceat iniquas observationes agere Kalendarum, et otiis vacare gentilibus, neque lauro aut viriditate arborum cingere domos. Omnis haec observatio paganismi est."

of leisure, and to adorn their houses round about with laurel and green trees,[1] he rendered a very great service indeed to folklore, for this seems to be the only prohibition of that Calends custom which has come down to us, and it is not until eight hundred years later that we can show houses to have been adorned with green and trees at New Year and Christmas. It is told, however, of the Sabinian king Tatius, to whom by the legend a date is given about the middle of the eighth century B.C., that in winter he received branches of a happy or fortunate tree from the grove of Streniae as favourable omens with respect to the new year. It is true that story is told by a Roman writer of about 400 A.D., Q. Aurelius Symmachus, and it cannot therefore be regarded as affording any evidence on a state of things twelve hundred years before that time. But the one thing certain from it is that, in the time of the Roman empire, there existed the habit of presenting to people, on the Calends of January, branches of trees for the sake of good luck in the new year.[2] It is again solely from

---

[1] *Viriditate arborum* can only mean the same as *viridibus arboribus*, and not "with green branches of trees"; *viriditas* never meaning leaves or branches, but referring simply to the colour.

[2] Rosinus, *Antiquitatum Romanarum Corpus Absolutissimum*, (ed. Dempster, Genevae, 1620), Lib. IV., chap. v., remarks: "Kalendas Ianuarii laetis precationibus faustum sibi invicem ominabantur teste, praeter Plinium et alios, Ovidio:

'At cur laeta tuis dicuntur verba Kalendis,
Et damus alternis, accipimusque preces.'

Item munera sibi invicem mittebant boni ominis causa, videlicet caricas, coriotides, et mella, ut dulces dies anni a dulcibus rebus auspicarentur: et stipem, id est, nummum signatum: quae omnia simul strenas appellarunt: cuius rei origo ad ipsum T. Tatium regem a Symmacho refertur, quod is verbenas e luco Streniae Deae acceperit, significans strenuis viris istas deberi. Strenam, inquit Festus, vocamus, quae datur die religioso, ominis boni gratia, a numero, quo significatur alterum, tertiumque venturum similis commodi, veluti trenam, praeposita S. litera, ut in loco, et lite solebant antiqui. Constituta autem per C. Octavium Augustum Monarchia, hic mos inolevit, ut equites ac reliquus populus ipsis etiam Imperatoribus strenam Kalendis Ianuarii conferrent: qua de re saepe loquitur Suetonius." The mention of Quintus Aurelius Symmachus refers to his *Epistolae*, Lib. X., Ep. xxviii.: "Ab exortu paene urbis Martiae strenarum usus adolevit, auctoritate Tatii Regis, qui verbenas felicis arboris ex luco Strenuae anni novi auspices primus accepit, D.D. Imperatores. Nomen indicio est viris strenuis haec convenire ob virtutem: atque ideo vobis huiusmodi insigne deberi; quorum divinus animus magis testimonium vigilantiae

this custom that we learn the meaning of the adornment of houses with laurel and green trees in the sixth century. These things were put up as good omens for the luck of the year. Even later evidence of this custom is very scarce. That in Italy it lived on we know at the end of the fifteenth century, through Polydore Vergil, who says: "Trimmyng of the Temples with hangynges, floures, boughes, and garlandes, was taken of the Heathen people, whiche decked their Idoles and houses with suche arraye."[1] In Germany the two fifteenth century witnesses for that usage come both from the Rhine country, from Strassburg, and both mention that at New Year's day the houses were adorned with green fir branches.[2]

---

quam omen expectat." The *verbenae felicis arboris* mentioned here played an important part in Roman ceremonies. Compare Ammianus Marcellinus, Lib. XXIX.: "Verbenas felicis arboris gestans." According to Servius, the term included branches of laurel, olive, and myrtles. A great number of instances are enumerated in the Lib. X. of the *Miscellanies* which accompany the *Epistles of Symmachus*, under Ep. xxviii., in the Paris edition of 1604, by A. Fr. The Christian poet Metellus, in his *Quirinales*, has put into eloquent verse the passage quoted above from Symmachus:

"Strenae praeterea nitent—Plures aureolae, munere regio,
Olim Principibus probis—Iani principiis auspicio datae,
Fausto temporis omine—Ut ferret Ducibus strenua strenuis
Annus gesta recentior.—Illas nobilitas Caesaribus piis,
Rex dignis Procerum dabat.—Urbi quas latiae tum iuveni dedit
Rex Titus Tatius prior,—Festas accipiens paupere munere
Verbenas studio Patrum.—Solleres posteritas quas creat aureas.
Servant dona tamen notam—A luco veteri nomine Strenuae."

[1] *An abridgegment of the notable worke of Polidore Vergile*, by Thomas Langley, London, 1551, Book V., chap. i., fol. 98a. This remark refers to festivals in general.

[2] Sebastian Brant, *Narrenschiff*, 1494, 65, 37 ss. in Zarncke's edition, Leipzig, 1854, p. 64:

"Vnd wer nit ettwas nuwes hat
Vnd vmb das nuw jor syngen gat,
Vnd gryen tann riss steckt in syn huss
Der meynt er leb das jor nit uss
Als die Egyptier hieltten vor,
Des glichen zuo dem nuwen jor
Wem man nit ettwas schencken duot
Der meynt das gantz jar werd nit guot."

And Geiler von Kaisersberg, *Die Emeis Dis ist das Buch von der Omeissen*, Strassburg, Grieninger, 1516.

In Strassburg it is also that, a hundred years later, the first Christmas tree appears, a usage which seems to have sprung out of the union of the habit of adorning houses with green branches and trees according to Roman Calends custom, and of a Christian tenth century legend, according to which, in the night when the Saviour was born, all trees bloom and bring forth fruits in the forest. This legend can be proved to have been very popular in the Germany of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

In England the same custom must have been popular, at least in the fifteenth century, even in the form of trees or artificial trees. "Against the Feast of Christmas, euery mans house, as also their parish Churches, were decked with Holm, Iuy, Bayes, and whatsoeuer the season of the yeere aforded to be greene. The Conduits and Standards in the streetes were, likewise, garnished. Amongst the which, I read, that in the yeere 1444, by tempest of thunder and lightning, on the first of February at night, Pauls steeple was fiered, but with great labour quenched, and toward the morning of Candlemas day, at the Leaden Hall in Cornhill, a Standard of tree being set up in the midst of the pauement, fast in the ground, nayled full of Holme and Iuy, for disport of Christmas to the people, was torne up and cast downe by the malignant Spirit (as was thought), and the stones of the pauement all about were cast in the streets, and into divers houses, so that the people were sore aghast at the great Tempests."[1] Gay, in his *Trivia*, sings:

> "When *Rosemary* and *Bays*, the poet's crown,
> Are bawl'd in frequent cries through all the town;
> Then judge the festival of Christmas near,
> Christmas, the joyous period of the year!
> Now with bright *Holly* all the temples strow
> With *Laurel* green, and sacred *Mistletoe*."

And from that time on there is a complete continuity of tradition as regards the adornment of houses and churches by holly and ivy, evergreen and mistletoe, box and bay. There are the well-known fifteenth century carols about the contest between Holly and Ivy:

> "Holly and Ivy, Box and Bay,
> Put in the Church on Christmas day."

---

[1] John Stow, *The Survay of London* (written A.D. 1598), London, 1618, pp. 149, 150.

V.—BEDA, DE MENSIBUS ANGLORUM.

A CENTURY after Roman Christianity had come to Britain, the largest part of it was christianized; and in one of its monasteries there lived and studied a youth of not yet twenty, the greatest genius of the early Anglic Church, Beda, whose life, probably, extended from A.D. 673 to 735, and to whom we owe some most important statements about the ancient Germanic calendar and ancient Germanic religion, to the extinction of which his life was devoted. Although he lived all his life in a Northern English monastery, he was in almost as close contact with Greco-Roman learning as any Goth had ever been, and was as good a Christian believer as any Roman could have been who spent his whole life in the immediate neighbourhood of the holy See. Put into a monastery at the age of seven, and brought up under the special care of Abbot Benedict, who was famous for his learning and the wide circle of his interests, he was estranged from the popular belief and customs of his home early enough to know comparatively little about them, and to care for them the less the more he was taught to regard them as the relics of a creed which led its followers unmistakably to eternal damnation.

The passage bearing on our question is chapter xv. in his work *De Temporum Ratione*, a book consisting, with the exception of that one chapter, solely of facts gathered from various Latin and Greek treatises on similar subjects, and showing an amount of classical and astronomical learning which is astounding. The chapter is headed *De Mensibus Anglorum*, and runs thus:—

"But the peoples of the ancient Angles (for it does not seem to me suitable to relate the yearly custom of other nations and to be silent about that of my own nation) counted their months after the moon's course; whence the latter, according to the habit of the Hebrews and Greeks, receive their name from the moon, the moon being called by them *Mona*, and the month *Monath*. And their first month, which the Latins call January, is called *Giuli*: then February, *Sol-monath*; March, *Rhed-monath*; April, *Eostur-monath*; May, *Thri-mylchi*; June, *Lida*; July, in the same

way, *Lida*; August, *Vueod-monath*; September, *Haleg-monath*; October, *Vinter-fylleth*; November, *Blot-monath*; December, *Giuli*, with the same name by which January is called. They began their year from the eighth day before the Calends of January [Dec. 25], on which we now celebrate the birthday of the Lord. And they then called that night, which is now sacrosanct to us, by a native word *Modranicht*, *i.e.*, night of mothers, as I suppose, because of the ceremonies which they performed in it, keeping watch all night. And when there was a common year, they gave to each of the single seasons three months. But when there occurred an Embolism, *i.e.*, a year of thirteen lunar months, they affixed the supernumerary month to the summer, so that then three months were called at the same time by the name of *Lida*, and on that account that year was called *Thri-lidi*, having four summer months, but the usual three months in each of the other seasons. Again, they divided, in the main, the whole year into two seasons, namely, into that of winter and that of summer; those six months in which the days are longer than the nights to be given to summer, the other six to winter. Hence, among other things, they called the month, with which the winter times began, *Vuinter-fylleth*, this name being composed of winter and full moon, of course, because from the full moon of that month winter took its beginning. Neither is it out of the way, if I take the trouble to interpret what is the meaning of the names of the other months of the Angles. The months *Giuli* get their names from the turning round of the sun towards the increasing of the day, because one of them precedes and the other follows it. *Sol-monath* can be called the month of cakes, which in it they offered to their gods; *Rhed-monath* is called after their goddess *Rheda*, to whom they sacrificed in it; *Eostur-monath*, which is now interpreted as the month of Pasch, was once called from their goddess named *Eostre*, to whom in it they celebrated festivals. After it we now name the time of Pasch, calling the joys of a new festivity by the wonted name of an ancient observance. *Thri-milchi* was thus called, because the domestic animals were in it milked three times a day. For such was, once upon a time, the fertility of Britain, or of Germany from which the nation of Angles entered Britain. *Lida* is called calm or navigable, because in each of the two months there is a genial serenity of the air and the sea

is usually navigated. *Veod-monath* is month of tares, because these abound very much at that time. *Haleg-monath* is the month of worship. *Vuinter-fylleth* may be called by a newly-made name winter-full-moon. *Blot-monath* is the month of immolation, because in it they devoted to their gods their cattle which they intended to kill. Thanks to Thee, good Jesus, who, turning us away from these vanities, hast granted unto us to bring Thee the sacrifices of praise!"[1]

---

[1] Giles's edition of *The Complete Works of the Venerable Bede*, VI., *Scientific Tracts and Appendix*, London, 1843, but with the addition of the deviations from it in Grimm's text, from Jacob Grimm's *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, Vol. I., Sec. Ed., Leipzig, 1853, pp. 56, 57, who says expressly that he used several texts for forming his own. The deviations or additions are given in brackets. The italics are mine:—

"De Mensibus Anglorum. Antiqui autem Anglorum populi (neque enim mihi congruum videtur, aliarum gentium annalem observantiam dicere, et meae reticere) juxta cursum lunæ suos menses computavere: unde et a luna Hebræorum et Græcorum more nomen accipiunt. Si quidem apud eos luna *Mona*, mensis *Monath* appellatur [apellatur *Monath*]. Primusque eorum mensis, quem Latini Januarium vocant, dicitur *Giuli*. Deinde Februarius, *Sol-monath*: Martius, *Rhed-monath* [*Hredmonath*]: Aprilis, *Eostur-monath*: Maius, *Thri-mylchi* [*Thrimilci*]: Junius, *Lida*: Julius similiter *Lida*: Augustus, *Vueod-monath* [*Veodmonath*]: September, *Haleg-monath*: October, *Vuinter-fylleth* [*Vintirfyllith*]: November, *Blod-monath* [*Blotmonath*]: December, *Giuli*, eodem quo Januarius nomine vocatur. Incipiebant autem annum ab octavo Calendarum Januariarum die, ubi nunc natale Dominicum celebramus. Et ipsam noctem nunc nobis sacrosanctam, tunc gentili vocabulo *Modranicht* [*Modranecht*], id est, matrum noctem appellabant: [ ] ob causam ut suspicamur ceremoniarum, quas in ea pervigiles agebant. Et quotiescunque communis esset annus, ternos menses lunares singulis anni temporibus dabant. Cum vero Embolismus, hoc est, XIII. mensium lunarium annus occurreret, superfluum mensem æstati apponebant, ita ut tunc tres menses simul *Lida* nomine vocarentur, et ob id annus ille [ ] *Thri-lidi* [*thrilidus*] cognominabatur, habens IV. menses æstatis, ternes ut semper temporum cæterorum. Item [Iterum] principaliter annum totum in duo tempora, hyemis videlicet, et æstatis dispartiebant: sex illos menses quibus longiores noctibus dies sunt æstati tribuendo, sex reliquos hyemi. Unde et mensem, quo hyemalia tempora incipiebant, *Vuinter-fylleth* [*Vintirfyllith*] appellabant, composito nomine ab hyeme et plenilunio, quia videlicet a plenilunio ejusdem mensis hyems sortiretur initium. Nec ab re est, si et cætera mensium eorum quid significent nomina [eorum nomina quid significent] interpretari curemus. Menses *Giuli* a conversione solis in auctum diei, quia unus eorum præcedit, alius subsequitur, nomina accipiunt. *Sol-monath* dici potest mensis placentarum, quas in eo Diis suis offerebant: *Rhed-monath* [*Hred-monath*] a Dea illorum *Rheda* [*Hreda*], cui in illo sacrificabant, nominatur: *Eostur-monath*, qui nunc Paschalis mensis interpretatur, quondam a Dea illorum quæ *Eostre* vocabatur, et cui in illo festa celebrabant, nomen habuit: a cujus nomine nunc Paschale tempus cognominant, consueto antiquæ observationis vocabulo gaudia novæ solemnitatis vocantes. *Tri-*

This is a very strange record indeed, and it is not easy to take up the proper attitude towards it. There is no doubt that, coming from so distinguished a scholar as Beda, it deserves most careful consideration and examination. One thing, however, is clear at first sight. When Beda speaks of the ancient Angles, there is no reason to doubt that he believed them to have had the views and customs he ascribes to them. But, on the other hand, it is quite plain that he could not have any direct information about their beliefs and rites, but simply inferred their views from what he knew about the Angles of his own time, either from direct observation or from hearsay. So all the allowance that can be made is that he heard the things he relates in his early childhood from people who were considerably older than he was, whilst some things he may have seen himself. Another feature of his report is remarkable: he divides his statement into two parts. In the first he simply gives what he regards as plain facts; in the second he gives explanations or speculations of his own, which certainly have their value as the opinions of so great a mind as Beda's, but cannot in any case count for more. He opens that part with the remark: "Neither is it out of the way if I take the trouble to interpret what is the meaning of the names of the other months of the Angles."

There is no doubt that Beda's record contains facts of great antiquity. The most striking thing in it is certainly the assertion that the Angles, even about his time, had a common name for December and January, and one for June and July, namely, *Giuli* and *Lida*, which means that they had still to some extent preserved the old three-score-day tides of Oriental extraction, which they had used before they came into contact with the Roman pre-Julian calendar, the basis of which was the moon and

---

milchi [*trimilci*] dicebatur quod tribus vicibus in eo per diem pecora mulgebantur. Talis enim erat quondam ubertas Britanniæ, vel Germaniæ de qua in Britanniam natio intravit Anglorum. *Lida* dicitur blandus, sive navigabilis [navigabilis eo quod] quod in utroque [utroque illo mense] mense et blanda sit serenitas aurarum, et navigari soleant æquora. *Vueod-monath* [*Veodmonath*] mensis zizaniorum quod ea tempestate maxime abundent. *Halag-monath* mensis sacrorum. *Vuinter-fylleth* [*Vintirfyllith*] potest dici composito novo nomine hyemeplenilunium [hiemiplenium]. *Blot-monath* mensis immolationum, quia [quod] in ea pecora quæ occisuri erant, Diis suis vovebant. Gratias [gratia] tibi, bone Jesu, qui nos ab his vanis avertens, tibi sacrificia laudis offerre donasti."

months. *Giuli* we know to have been in use two hundred years earlier among the Goths, *i.e.*, an Eastern Germanic tribe living as far distant as Italy from the Western Germanic Angles, though, according to the Gothic calendar of the Bobbio MS., *Iiuleis* then meant November and December, and not December and January. This latter difficulty we have solved already by showing that the old Germanic three-score-day tides began about the middle of the Roman months, so that *Iiuleis* covered approximately the time from November 15 to January 15, and was, among the Goths, shifted a fortnight backwards so as to correspond to Roman November and December, and among the Angles a fortnight forwards, so as to cover December and January. *Lida*, the name for the middle of summer, is new to us, and we have to be grateful to Beda for preserving it. That exactly four months are between *Giuli* and *Lida* shows that no confusion has taken place, but that two other three-score-day tides have to stand between them. When Beda, however, tells us that in a leap year, as in the pre-Julian calendar, a whole month was inserted, and that the leap year therefore was called *Thrilidi* and the thirteenth month the third *Lida*, this state of things cannot be old, but must be the consequence of the introduction of the pre-Julian calendar. For *Lida* was not at all the name of a month among the ancient Angles, but of a three-score-day tide, so that thirty days added would have meant only half a *Lida*, and there would have been one *Lida* and a half, and not three *Lidas*. Besides, the Angles having no months, but only three-score-day tides, could not insert a month in a leap year, but, had they inserted anything at all, would have inserted a whole three-score-day tide every sixth year, just as the later Scandinavians objected to the insertion of a single leap day, but waited till the past leap days amounted to a week, then inserting a whole week at a time, so that the year always began with the same week-day, *i.e.*, Thursday.

However much we owe Beda for the preservation of those two ancient names of three-score-day tides, *Giuli* and *Lida*, we cannot conceal from ourselves the fact that the very names of those two tides amount to a complete proof that the other eight month-names which Beda mentions *are not old*. So we have a right to express our regret that Beda was not, by the existence of two names for three-score-day tides, put upon the right

track towards an understanding of the ancient Germanic year, and that he did not take all possible trouble to find out the names of the other four three-score-day tides, which, together with *Giuli* and *Lida*, formed a complete Germanic year of, probably, three hundred and sixty or three hundred and sixty-six days. In his time it should have been possible to ascertain something about them. Perhaps even all of them were still in use among the country population of the north of England, and some ingenuity and perseverance might have sufficed to gather them.

The eight month-names which Beda mentions, beside *Giuli* and *Lida*, are not old, and it is, indeed, not too difficult to see that. One of them is called *Thrimilci*, a name which shows a very suspicious parallelism to *Thrilidi*. However important a fact it must be for a tribe consisting of herdsmen and hunters that the cattle can be milked three times a day, we have Beda's own word for it that, in his time, it was not a fact at all, but only a legend, a legend of a golden age in the far-away past, when such was "the fertility of Britain, or of Germany from which the nation of Angles entered Britain." A second month is said to bear the ingenious name of *Winter-fylleth*, or winter full moon, which is not a month-name at all, but merely the name of a date from which the beginning of winter was supposed to be reckoned. Besides, this looks rather like a counterpart to the calculation of the Christian Easter-festival, and would amount to the fact that the winter, the beginning of which was, in common Germanic times, at the same time the beginning of the year, began in the middle of the month! The remaining six month-names are compounds of *mânôth*, and thus characterize themselves as being late formations. No scholar now would ascribe any considerable age to the Germanic month-names, since even Professor Weinhold, who has overlooked the fact that the Germanics received the institution of months from the Romans, professes that there were no month-names in common Germanic times. Besides, they can only be taken as representative of a purely local denomination of months. Neither *Rugern* (August?), which we know from an even older source,[1] nor *hlŷd-mônath*, or *hlyda* for March;[2] *sedr-*

[1] King Vihtraed's Laws, A.D. 696. [2] Martius *rêdhe*, *Hlŷda* heálic Menologium, 37.

mônadh, *midsumor* for June; *mædmônath* for July; or *hearfestmônath* for September, which occur in almost contemporaneous literature, are amongst them. Nay, they contain scarcely a single month-name which appears a second time in Anglo-Saxon.[1] Of the six month-names composed with *mânôth* Beda apparently knows the right etymology of only two, these being *Blôtmânôth* (November), the month of immolation, or, as he says, the month in which the Angles "devoted to their gods their cattle which they intended to kill," and *Haleg-mânôth* (September), holy-month, or month of worship, a name probably resting on a Christian foundation. As regards the etymology of the other four, he makes vague guesses. That August should be called *Veod-manoth*, *i.e.*, "month of tares, because these abound very much at that time," is very doubtful, and a very poor explanation indeed. How *Sol-manoth* (February) should come to mean month of cakes nobody can say, there being no such word meaning anything like cake in any Germanic language. When he has exhausted all resources, he takes refuge in the assumption that the names he cannot explain are names of imaginary goddesses. *Eostre* comes from a root *ausrô*, which is cognate to Latin *aurora* and Greek ἠώς, and means something like spring. Professor Weinhold says: "I explain *eósturmônad* simply as spring-month, notwithstanding Beda's *dea Eostre*, in whom I do not believe, so long as it has not been proved that the principal feast of the Church could be called after a heathen goddess. Doubts I also entertain as regards his *dea Hreda*, who is said to have given a name to March. That Beda's strength did not lie in etymology is shown by his explanation of *solmônad* as the month of offering cakes, and his remark on *Giuli*";[2] and at another place he states,[3] "I, at least, regard Beda's explanation of *Hredmônad* and *Eóstre-mônad* as bad guesses, and do not believe in any goddesses *Hreda* and *Eóstre* (which doubts have, as I observe, been uttered before by Leo,

---

[1] *Hlýda* for March comes dangerously near to *Lída* for June-July. If February and March, or originally January 15 to March 15, were *Lída*, the insertion of a leap month would almost take place on the same date as it did in the pre-Julian calendar, where it was inserted into February, which, of course, was impracticable in the highest degree.

[2] *Die deutschen Monatnamen*, Halle, 1869, p. 4.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

Rectitudines, p. 206)." I should not wonder, if in *Hreda* and *Eostre* names of two old three-score-day tides were preserved, which had in Beda's time become limited to the time of a month. They can be as little explained as *Giuli* or *Lida* (*Hlyda*).

Whilst Beda knows of a dual division of the Anglic year, which was bound to be familiar to him on the ground of the existence of the two terms *winter* and *summer* together covering the whole course of a year, he knows nothing whatever of a tri-partition and the legal institutions resting on it, although that tri-partition is a fact warranted as well as any from the early history of the Germanic tribes. Instead, he gives us a description of the Roman year of the Julian calendar, which is quartered by solstices and equinoxes, a statement which is the more extraordinary, as, from what he said before, it is quite plain that he thought the Angles to have a lunar year of 354 days, into which now and then (presumably every third year) a whole intercalary month had to be inserted, just as under the reign of the Roman pre-Julian calendar. His words practically amount to the following proposition: Whilst the Anglic year, according to his own description, was a lunar year, it yet began at the winter solstice. This, of course, means that it was not a lunar year, which is quite out of the question, since we not only know that the Germanics began their year with the beginning of winter and not at the winter solstice, but that, in addition, the common Germanic language possessed not even a term for solstice; nay, that, when the Western Germanics had got the term and meaning of solstice from the Romans, they never used it for the winter solstice, but solely for June 24, all through the Middle Ages. Nor is that all. According to Beda's description the Anglic year did not begin at the real solstice (which A.D. 701 fell at four o'clock in the morning of December 18),[1] but on December 25, the date which Julius Caesar had erroneously fixed for the solstice. When he comes to speculations confessedly his own, the value of his statements becomes still more doubtful. He says that the Angles called December and January *Giuli*, after "the turning round of the sun towards the increasing of the day, because one of them precedes

[1] I owe all calculations about the real dates of solstices to Prof. Hermann Jacobi of Bonn.

and the other follows." This can only mean that the Anglic *Giuli* extended from about November 25 to January 24, so that the first *Giuli* ended at December 25, a statement contradictory to the other statement that the Anglic months were identical with the Roman months. Further, we know that the Gothic *Iiuleis* tide extended from November 1 to December 31, and that the common Germanic *Iiuleis* tide probably extended from November 15 to January 15, and that, consequently, December 25 was by no means the middle of it. So if Beda means to say, that *Giuli* was originally the name of the winter solstice, and that from it December and January received their names (a statement, however, he himself gives merely as his own supposition, or interpretation, as he chooses to call it, and by no means as a warranted fact), he may without any hesitation be said to be wrong—the more so as he goes on to say that the day of the alleged solstice (to which he ascribes in one sentence the name *Giuli*) was called *modraniht*, *i.e.*, night of mothers, so that we may conclude from this that it was not called *Giuli*.

Such a mass of mutually contradictory facts cannot be explained by being ascribed to Beda's inaccurate observation and expression, though he may not have understood absolutely all he was told, and not have expressed things as carefully as he might have done on a Christian dogmatic subject. That the names he gives, or at least names similar to them, were used within the neighbourhood of Beda's home in his own or his parents' time nobody will dispute. But he apparently received from those sources merely facts, and no theory with them. The theory he must have formed out of what he thought the bearing of the facts. And he was bound to misunderstand the bulk of his facts, because he mistook them for ancient Anglic customs, whilst, in reality, they were the product of a strange shifting of old elements under the influence of the pre-Julian Roman calendar, followed by the Julian calendar, and by the attempts of the Church to make the supposed night of the winter solstice, which had been made Christ's birthday, the beginning of the year as well. So in Beda's time there were four distinct layers, one above the other, in the popular notions about the course of the year, and if we bear this in mind all the seeming difficulties are elucidated. Whilst the observation of new moons

and full moons among the Germanics had nothing to do with their theory of the course of the year, Beda thought it had. Whilst they owed to the Romans their leap month and the conception of months altogether, he mistook these things for a genuine Anglic growth. Whilst the Germanic year began at the beginning of winter, he made the Angles begin their year in the middle of it. Whilst the Germanics knew nothing of solstices and equinoxes, Beda based his theory of the Germanic year on them, and put into the centre of all his theory the 25th day of December, which was bound to be dear to him, both as the alleged day of the solstice according to the Julian calendar, and as the day of Christ's birth, venturing even the suggestion that originally that day was called *Giuli*, and that December and January had got their common name from it.

That in this suggestion he was wrong, appears from the fact that, except in the Anglo-Saxon version of Beda himself, there is no case known in which December 25 is called Yule in the three centuries which followed Beda's life, *i.e.*, up to the eleventh century. And even then there are few cases which are not doubtful for one reason or other. Either the MSS. are of too late date, or the original is not preserved, or interpolations are suspected. This state of things is the more strange, as December 25 is frequently referred to, *e.g.*, in the *Saxon Chronicle*. But it invariably is called by the calendar term *midwinter*, *midwinter's mass*, or *to Nativited*, neither the Parker MS. nor the Laud MS. of the *Saxon Chronicle* containing a single *Yule*. *Geóhel*, *geóhhel-dæg*, *geóhol*, *geóhhol*, *geól*, *giûl*, *iûl* are the forms appearing in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. When towards the end of the eleventh century *Jól*,[1] with the popular meaning of December 25,

[1] There is no doubt that Old Northern *jól*, Original Northern *jul*, Gothic *Jiuleis* is not identical, and has absolutely nothing to do with A.S. *hveol*, Old Northern *hvel*, English *wheel*; for the Anglo-Saxon word corresponding to Old Northern *jól* is *Geola*, *gehhol*, *geohhol* (Kluge, *Englische Studien*, IX., p. 311 ss.). Deriving with Kluge (*Englische Studien*, IX., 311) and Bugge (*Arkiv for Nordisk Filologi*, IV., 135), *jól*, A.S. *gehhol*, from an original Germanic **jehwela*, and declaring with Bugge the latter as identical with Latin *joculus*, Professor Mogk (Paul's *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*, Strassburg, 1891, Vol. I., p. 1125) finds this denomination as the "gay festival" appropriate, because masquerades, especially in the shape of animals, are the custom then. But, apart from the fact that I regard the establishment of a relation between *joculus* and **jehwela* as a

sets in, it is apparently due to Scandinavian influence, where that word had come to mean Christmas through Hakon, King of Norway, who reigned from 940 to 963, and had shifted to December 25 the date of an old February festival, which in the course of time had come to be celebrated between January 9 and 14, with the view of celebrating it at the same day as that on which the Christians celebrated the birth of Christ. In England the new term for Christmas became popular in the twelfth century, but in Scotland not before the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, so that it is only in the fifteenth that mentions of it in Scotland become very frequent.

---

very bold etymological attempt, the mummery and masquerade at the beginning of January are missing just where that time is called Yule. These usages were a Roman Calends-of-January custom, and were on Germanic soil limited to Gaul and to the extreme west of Germany, where the Roman influence was strongest. Professor Weinhold adduces the Cyprian term *Ἰούλιος*, which is assumed to have covered the time from December 22 to January 23, and which he, as Grimm's follower, boldly derives from the month of July, maintaining that the name of the month of the summer solstice (which, however, is June!) was transferred to the time of the winter solstice! He assumes that the Germanics did the same, but fails to perceive that, as the name is found among Goths, Northern Germanics, and Anglo-Saxons, we should in this case have to assume that it had been received at a time when Goths, Scandinavians, and Anglo-Frisians spoke one language. He further overlooks the fact that, in the Germanic languages, it is not a month-name at all, but the name of an Oriental three-score-day tide, so that the alleged analogy with the Cyprian name—which is by no means proved to have had anything to do with the Roman month of July—does not even hold good, though the whole argument is based upon it (Weinhold, *Deutsche Monatnamen*, Halle, 1869, p. 4; *Deutsche Jahrteilung*, 1862, p. 15; K. Fr. Hermann, *Über griechische Monatskunde*, Göttingen, 1844, p. 64; Grimm, *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, 1848, I., pp. 78 and 106, 107). The form of the Greek name varies considerably, as was shown above. In some cases it is not sure which month is meant. Perhaps, we have, as I suggested before, to do there with a relic of the same Oriental six-fold division of the year as among the Germanics, and, consequently, with the same name for November and December. Still more uncertain is the connection of *Giuli* with the name of a Greek song or exclamation, *ἴουλος*:

Δενδαλίδας τευχοῦσα καλὰς ᾔειδεν ἰούλους

(preparing the salted flour she sang the pleasant *Iuloi*). Jamieson, *Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language*, under "Yule" says: "Didymus and Athenaeus assert that the hymn was in honour of Ceres," and the same thing is intimated by Theodoret in his work, *De Materia et Mundo*, when he says: "Let us not sing the *Iiulos* to Ceres, nor the *Dithyrambos* to Bacchos."

The laws of King Alfred, composed about 888, ordained that whoever stole on Sunday, or at Christmas, or at Easter, or on Holy Thursday, or on Rogation days, or during Lent-fast, should be fined twice as much as he who stole at other times.[1] Here *on Gehhol* apparently does not mean the day of Nativity, but the time about that day in so far as it was proclaimed holy by the Church, which would not be longer than twelve nights. So it shows a decided narrowing of the old term which once covered a three-score-day tide, and, later, apparently a single month, but it does not yet mean December 25 alone, a sense which it does not seem to have reached before the eleventh century.[2]

---

[1] Thorpe's *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England*, London, 1840, Vol. I., p. 64, v.: "Sethe staladh ôn Sunnan niht. oththe on Gehhol. oththe on Eastron. oththe on thone Halgan Dunres dæg. on Gang-dagas. thara gehwelc we willadh sie twy-bote. swa on Lencten-fæsten." Thorpe's *Ancient Laws*, II., 450 (*Alfredi Legum Versio Antiqua*) v.: "Qui furatur die Dominica, vel in sancto Natali, vel in Pascha, vel in Sancto die Iovis, in Ascensione Domini, in quolibet eorum volumus dupliciter emendandum sit, sicut in quadragesimali jejunio." Christmas was to be held for twelve festival days (*freols*), whilst Easter was held for fourteen, and in the harvest a whole week before St. Mary-mass was celebrated. Thorpe's *Ancient Laws*, Vol. I., p. 92, xliii.: "Be Mæsse Daga Freolse: Eallum frioum monnum thas dagas sien forgifene butan theowum mannum ond esne-wyrhtum. XII. dagas on Gehhol. ond thone dæg the Crist thone deofol oferswidhde. ond Scs Gregorius gemynd-dæg. ond. VII. dagas to Eastron ond. VII. ofer ond an dæg æt Sce Petres tide and Sce Paules. ond on hærfeste tha fullan wican ær Scta Marian mæssan. ond æt Eallra haligra weordhunge anne dæg. ond. IIII. Wodnesdagas on. IIII. Ymbren-wican. Dheowum monnum eallum sien forgifen tham the him leofost sie to sellanne. æghwæt thæs the him ænig mon for Godes noman geselle. Oththe hie on ænegum hiora hwilsticcum geearnian mægen."

[2] Unfortunately of the four manuscripts which contain Aelfred's laws, three are of the tenth century and one is of the twelfth century, the MS. British Museum, Nero EI belonging to the end of the tenth century, and the Textus Roffensis to the twelfth century (Wülker, *Grundriss zur Geschichte der angelsächsischen Literatur*, Leipzig, 1885, p. 399). How cautious one has to be in order not to take later expressions for older ones the following example may show, in which later manuscripts replace *middan-wintra* by *geolum* and *ûres Dryhtnes gebyrd-tide*. A note added to Theodore's *Book of Penitence* (*Liber Poenitentialis Theodori Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis Ecclesiae*), ed. in Thorpe's *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England*, London, 1840, Vol. II., p. 46, cap. xxxviii., § 14: "In illa die ante Natale Domini hora nona expleta missa, id est vigilia Domini, manducant Romani; Græci vero dicta vespere missa cœnant," mentions the different customs of the Roman and Greek churches as regards fasting on Christmas eve, without giving any particulars about what is to be done. Whilst the Greeks eat not before six p.m., the Romans take

It is the same thing with the first documentary evidence of *Iôl*. In it the term also means the holy tide about *Natale Domini*. It occurs in Edward the Confessor's writ of privileges to the Abbey of Ramsey, co. Huntingdon,[1] to be dated between 1042 and 1066, but preserved only in a twelfth century manuscript.[2]

---

food after three p.m.; and Ecbert's *Confessional and Penitential* (*Confessionale et Poenitentiale Ecberti, Archiepiscopi Eboracensis*). ed. in Thorpe's *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England*, London, 1840, Vol. II., pp. 162, 163, gives details about the fast time before Christmas: "Legitima jejunia tria sunt in anno; unum pro omni populo, ut illud XL. diebus ante Pascha, cum decimam partem annuam solvimus; et illud XL. diebus ante Natale Domini, cum totus populus pro se orant, et orationes legunt; et illud XL. diebus post Pentecosten; Dhreo æfæstenu syndon on geare. ân ofer eall folc. swa that XL. nihta foran to Eastron. thonne we thone teodhan sceat thæs geares lysad. and that XL. nihta ær geolum. thonne gebiddedh hine eall that werod fore. and orationes rædadh. and that XL. nihta ofer Pentecosten." Instead of "geolum," which is the reading of O, Y has "middan-wintra," and Bx has "ûres Dryhtnes zebyrd-tîde," while X and Y add the following: "On tham ærran dæge æt geolum [Y, middan-wintra] æt nône sidhdhan mæsse bydh gesungen. heo gereordiadh Romane. Grecas to æfenne. thonne æfen bidh gesungen and mæsse. thonne fôdh hi to mete." Of these O is a small folio MS. of *Corpus Christi*, C.C. 190 (L XII.); Y is a small narrow volume of the eleventh century, *Bodleiana*, Laud, F 17; B is a tenth century octavo MS., *Corpus Christi*, 265 (K 2); X is a MS. of about 1000 A.D. belonging to the Bibliothèque des Ducs de Bourgogne; O, which Thorpe, contrary to his custom, has wisely abstained from dating, belongs to the twelfth century, and is said to have been given to Exeter Cathedral by Bishop Leofric.

[1] John Earle, *A Hand-Book to the Land-charters and other Saxonic Documents*, Oxford, 1888, pp. 344, 345.

[2] *Cottoniana*, Otho. *B.*, XIV., f. 257: "inne Iol and inne Easterne and inne dha hâli wuca æt Gangdagas.," "in natali dominico, in pascha, et in sancta hebdomada rogationum." In the *Exchequer Rolls of Scotland* for the years 1264 till 1359 (*Rotuli Scaccarii Regum Scotorum*, ed. by J. Stuart and G. Burnett, Vol. I., 1264-1359, Edinburgh, 1878), the word "Yule" never occurs; while in the *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland* from 1473 to 1498 (*Compota Thesaurariorum Regum Scotorum*, ed. by Th. Dickson, Vol. I., 1473-1498, Edinburgh, 1877), it is mentioned many times. Even very much later Yule by no means referred to Christmas day exclusively, but to the whole season. *The History and Chronicles of Scotland*, written in Latin by Hector Boece, and translated by John Bellenden, Edinburgh, 1821, Vol. II., p. 340, Lib. XIII., chap. xiv. (under King Alexander II., A.D. 1222): "In the third yeir eftir, the Erle of Caithnes come to king Alexander, quhen he wes sittand with his modir, on the Epiphany day, at his yuill, and desirit grace." Hollinshead, in his *Scottish Chronicle*, in which he followed Bellenden, even says (under A.D. 1222): "As King Alexander with his mother Ermingard were sitting at their banket, on the 12th day in Christmas, otherwise called Yule," etc.

Beda's report contains another item which must be touched upon. He says, the ancient Angles "began their year from the eighth day before the Calends of January, on which we now celebrate the birthday of the Lord. And they then called that night, which is now sacrosanct to us, by a native word, *Modranicht*, *i.e.*, night of mothers, as I suppose because of the ceremonies which they performed in it, keeping watch all night."

Instances from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, of Yule as identical with Christmas, are:

"Till Auld Meldrum thai yeid thair way,
And thar with thair men logyt thai,
Before Yhule ewyn a nycht but mar:
A thowsand, trow I, weile thai war."
Barbour, IX., 204, MS. (+ A.D. 1375).

"A-pon a Yhule-ewyn alsua
Wyttalis, that to the Kyng suld ga
Of Ingland, that at Melros lay,
He met rycht stowtly in the way."
Wyntown, VIII., 36, 39 (+ circa A.D. 1430).

The spelling in the last quarter of the fifteenth century is Yule, Ywle, Yole, and Yowle (*Compota Thesaurariorum Regum Scotorum*, *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland*, ed. by Thomas Dickson, Vol. I., 1473-1498, Edinburgh, 1877: Yule, p. 17; Ywle, p. 99; Yole, p. 239; Yowle, p. 245), and the term was used as identical with Christmas. P. 17, "fra Pasche to Yule," from Easter to Christmas; p. 99, again Ywle, a short time before Christmas; p. 239 gives quite a number of points of time, from "the VIII. day of November" and "Sanct Martinis day" to "Sanct Nicholas day" (on which also "tua Sanct Nicholas bischoppis" appear who receive "XXXVI. s."), "Sanct Androis day," and "Yole," the festival at which day is called "the Kingis Yole." We find there the terms used: "upone Yole day"; "Sonday eftir Yole," and (p. 240) simply "eftir Yole." On p. 240 also occur "vpone Newger daye" and "on Vphaliday"; while p. 241 has "on Candilmess day," "on Sanct Patrikis day," "agane Pasche," "before Pasche," "on Pasche day" (twice); and p. 242, "vpone Sanct James daye," "vpone Sanct Michaelis day," and "the VI. day of Nouember." As a family name Yule (Yole) appears in the *Exchequer Rolls of Scotland*, Vol. IV., 1406-1436, pp. 411, 621, 675 and elsewhere. In 1494 at the Royal Court of Scotland some timber was bought from Jonete Gule. Item, foi III.** burdis fra Jonete Gule III. li. XV. s. (*Compota Thesaurariorum Regum Scotorum*, *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland*, ed. by Thomas Dickson, Edinburgh, 1877, p. 252). As late as 1636 datings occur like "decimo tertio die mensis Januarii nuncupato *lie twentie day of Yule* (*Charters and other Documents relating to the City of Glasgow*, A.D. 1175-1649, Part II., edited by Sir James D. Marwick, Glasgow, 1894, p. 386, "Charter by King Charles I.").

However critical the attitude one may take up towards Beda's etymologies and theories about the course of the year, there is no getting over the fact of the word *modranicht* being applied in his time to December 25, a word which admits of one explanation only, that explanation being: night of mothers. This word has been the centre of much discussion, and the object of a number of very divergent explanations. Jacob Grimm thought of the mothers of *Heimdallr*, of whom Scandinavian poetry tells us; others thought of the mother of gods worshipped by a Germanic tribe, according to Tacitus;[1] others of a Germanic belief in a newly-born sun. But all these suggestions have lately been driven into the background by another theory started by Professor Eugen Mogk of Leipzig. He supposed Beda's word to refer to the *Matronae* of Romano-Germanic inscriptions, whom he identifies with Old Scandinavian *dísar*, and to a cult of the dead about that time of the year.[2] He, besides, takes Beda's name *modra-nicht* as a collective singular denoting a number of nights, a whole holy tide, devoted to the dead, the female genii of protection, the souls of the deceased, whilst Beda decidedly speaks of a single night only. But if one goes so far, one may go further. In classical literature even there is a mention of deities called *the Mothers*. Plutarch tells us[3] that the town of Engyon, of Sicily, was celebrated for the appearance of goddesses who were called the *Mothers*. Such *Mothers*, mostly three in number, appear rather frequently in inscriptions in Germanic countries which had come into close contact with the Romans, whilst they are lacking entirely in Scandinavia and Iceland.[4] Professor Mogk's opinion is untenable, because

[1] "Matrem deûm venerantur Aestii; insigne superstitiorum formas aprorum gestant" (*Germania*, chap. xlv.).

[2] In his *Mythologie* in Paul's *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*, Strassburg, 1891, I., p. 1126.

[3] In his *Marcellus*, chap. xx.

[4] Dr. Collingwood Bruce, in his *Handbook to the Roman Wall: a Guide to Tourists traversing the Barrier of the Lower Isthmus*, 3rd edition, London, Longmans, 1885, says p. 155 s.: "It may be well also to mention that the worship of the *Deae Matres*—the good mothers—whose name it was not lucky to mention, was much in vogue with the Romans of a later age, especially with the Gothic portion of the Roman community. Several statues of them have been found here; two of these, shown in the woodcuts on the previous page (155), are now preserved in the Museum of the Newcastle Society of

it rests on the assumption that there once was a Germanic dead festival about the middle of winter. But it was shown above that the facts which seem to support such an opinion do not in reality support it. For at their basis is the Egypto-Roman "Table of Fortune," and no sacrifice to the dead. He who dares to put that interpretation upon Beda's words may assume that in it these deities are referred to. But it is certain that he has not properly read Beda's words.

Beda himself says that he does not know why the Angles called that night *modranicht*, and expressly gives his explanation as a supposition of his own, introduced by the words "as I suppose" (*ut suspicamur*). The allusion he makes by way of explanation is not to goddesses called *The Mothers*, as he speaks of a goddess *Hreda* or a goddess *Eostre* in the same chapter; but just as he derives the name *Solmanoth* from the *cake* baked, or the name *Blotmanoth* from the *immolation* made, so he ascribes the name *modranicht* to the *ceremonies* which were performed, and by no means to the object of veneration, a certain deity. Whilst he elsewhere clearly states the *tertium comparationis*, he in this case refrains from it, simply remarking that the name *modranicht* is probably due to certain ceremonies

---

Antiquaries. These figures usually occur in triplets." On p. 201 another statue of one of the *Deae Matres* is mentioned, which was found at Birdoswald, the Amboglanna of the Romans, the twelfth station of the Roman Wall of England. It is represented by Dr. Bruce in a woodcut on p. 202. The body of the figure was, in 1885, kept in a farmhouse, while the head was preserved in the Museum of Newcastle. Other examples are contained in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Britannicarum*, Vol. VII., *Additamenta quarta*, p. 282, No. 844, a stone of Camulodunum now kept in the Museum there. It has the inscription: "Matribus Sulevis Similis Atti f(ilius) ci(vis) Cant(ius) v(otum) l(ibens) s(olvit)." Another inscription (927) is devoted to the Domestic Mothers: "Civliv Crescesi Matribus Domesticis vs m. l." (found in St. Mary's Convent, Eburacum). Nos. 980 and 992, 993, seem to belong to the same group, and perhaps even 1017: "(Mat?)ribus com-(munibus?) (p)ro salute de(curiae?) (A)ur(elii) Severi," because there is another stone devoted, "Matribus Com(munibus)" (1032); 1054, "Matribus . . . ntius," 1081; a part of an altar having the inscription, "Matribus tr(a)mar(inis)," 1091, which shows the syllables "Ma," "SA" may be attributed to *Mars* as well as to the *Matres*. Perhaps the most important inscription is 1186: "I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) Tarami Belatucabro Mogvnto . . . Movno . . . Deabus Matribus Deae Svriae Fortunae ceterisq(ue) Britannorum Dis Deabusq(ue) C(um) verius Fortis(simis) Trib(us) Coh(ortibus) I(ulius) Ael(ianus), Britonn(icus) V(otum) S(olvit)."

of which he knows, but does not care to inform the reader. There is only one explanation possible: these ceremonies were of a maternal character, being either exercised by human mothers, or having as their chief constituent something maternal or referring to the natural functions of motherhood. Customs of that kind are certainly found in the Roman *Matronalia* and in the Calends-of-January customs on the banks of the Rhine.

The Romans celebrated, on the first of March, the *Calendae Feminarum*, the so-called *Matronalia*, at which the married ladies of Rome went to the Esquiline Hill to the temple of Lucina—celebrating the festival of matrimony.[1] If that festival had been brought to Britain by Roman legions, it could, when the beginning of the year was, by the Julian calendar, shifted from March 1 to January 1, have been removed with it to the Calends of January, and, when the Christian birthday of Christ, on December 25, began to compete with the Calends of January, have been transferred to that day. Something similar seems to have taken place indeed on the banks of the Rhine in Germany, where on the Calends of January men went about in women's dresses, using that disguise as a means for all kinds of sexual transgressions, or women went about in hides of hinds, whilst men wore hides of stags, licentiousness of every description prevailing.[2] But I do not think that Beda thought of things like these. Had he done so, he would probably have used stronger language, mentioning the abominable disgrace of heathendom. And there certainly is something decidedly Christian in the report, the *keeping watch all night*, a peculiarity of the early Church which again and again occurs at Christmas eve and at Pasch eve, and about which elaborate rules existed. If the custom he referred to was Christian, or might be considered as Christian, or as happening even in a Christian Anglic community, by those who might read his record, the reserve Beda uses in this case would be explained only too well. And there were indeed such usages in the early Church, ceremonies which had evolved out of the Roman Calends usage of preparing

[1] Ovid, *Fasti*, III., 179 ss.

[2] *Homilia De Sacrilegiis*, ed. by Caspari, Christiania, 1886: "Et illud quid turpe est! Viri tunicis mulierum induentes se feminas videri volunt." See the list of cases quoted in the above chapter headed the "Calends of January."

and eating cakes with certain observances. These had got into very close connection to motherhood, producing a kind of obscene cult, in which the motherhood of Virgin Mary and the peculiarities of Christ's birth were not only made the object of veneration, but were expressed in visible symbols in the shape of cakes. In such celebrations human mothers no doubt took the leading part. From the night of birth to the night of motherhood and the night of mothers there are only two small steps. That the night of the birth of a child should be dedicated to all mothers or to motherhood is only natural. But over and above, we can prove the existence of such a cult, exactly contemporaneous with Beda, because it was forbidden by the Council of Trullus, A.D. 706. The development of a cult of the Virgin Mary instead of that of her divine son, is clearly traceable in the Councils of the early Church. Seeking for ever new objects of veneration and supplying the "eternal feminine," which was found lacking in the new religion, orientals and occidentals gave visible expression to all kinds of wild fancies about the act of Christ's birth, so that the Church had again and again to declare that he was born quite unlike human babies,[1] and above all, without an afterbirth, so that it was quite senseless of people to bake, divide, and eat a cake in honour of the afterbirth of the immaculate Virgin. Later, even the confinement of the Virgin seems to have been made the subject of imitation.[2] Beda was bound to know that custom

[1] *Acta Conciliorum*, Parisiis, 1714, Vol. III., col. 1690, *Concilium Quinisextum sive in Trullo*, A.D. 706, Canon lxxix.: "Absque ullis secundis ex Virgine partum esse confitentes ut qui sine semine constitutus sit, idque toti gregi annuntiantes, eos, qui propter ignorantiam aliquid faciunt quod non decet, correctioni subiicimus. Quare quoniam aliqui post sanctae Christi Dei nostri nativitatis diem similam coquere ostenduntur, et eam sibi invicem impertiri, honoris scilicet praetextu secundinarum impollutae Virginis matris . . ." *Ibid.*, Vol. II., col. 1014, *Decrees of Pope Hormisdas* (A.D. 514-523), iii.; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, Oxford, 1871, Vol. III., p. 146, *De Beata Virgine.*

[2] It is a strange chance that we are able to show that this custom of representing in some way the confinement of the Virgin spread also over Great Britain, taking there even a more characteristic form. As late as 1800 it prevailed in Scotland (Jamieson, *An Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language*, under "Yule," VII.), where on the morning of the twenty-fifth of December one got up before the rest of the family and prepared food for them, which had to be eaten in bed. This frequently consisted of cakes baken with eggs, called Care-cakes.

as a heathen and abominable custom, it having been interdicted and having been alluded to in the Decrees of Pope Hormisdas (514-523), and in the canons of the Lateran Council of A.D. 649 under Pope Martin I., which had been brought to Great Britain by John the Precentor and adopted by the Council of Hatfield, A.D. 680. During Beda's own life-time the whole matter had been thoroughly treated in Canon LXXIX. of the Council of Trullus, A.D. 706. But, of course, he could know customs of that kind only from hearsay or from his own experience, at any rate only as being contemporaneous. That in a thing so wicked, which to his pure mind was so unsympathetic, he did not see a growth upon the soil of the Church, but a relic of heathendom, we cannot wonder. And he was not wrong therein. He erred only in so far as he did not ascribe it to the Roman Calends of January, at which the *Strenae* were in vogue, but to an imaginary cult exercised by the Angles in the very night on which the Church had fixed Christ's birthday.

No. XIII.

RECENT ARCHÆOLOGICAL DISCOVERIES IN THE PARISH OF LESMAHAGOW.

BY

JAMES YOUNG, LESMAHAGOW.

[*Read at a Meeting of the Society held on 17th December, 1896.*]

THE late Mr. Greenshields of Kerse, in his *Annals of Lesmahagow*, says: "Lesmahagow formed part of the Kingdom of Strathclyde, which consisted of the southern and larger portion of the district inhabited by the Celtic tribe, called by Ptolemy the Damnii. It was occupied by the Romans as early as the first century of the Christian era, and was included in their province of Valentia. Strathclyde was never so thoroughly subdued as to become a Roman territory in which established tranquillity prevailed." In this, I believe, Mr. Greenshields to be right so far as Lesmahagow is concerned, as throughout our whole parish, which is eleven miles by twelve, scarcely anything Roman has been found, and the only Roman road which can be traced is in the lower outskirts of the parish, connecting the east with the west, while on the other side of the Clyde from us the Romans have left many traces behind them, in roads, camps, stations, etc., etc. It seems to me that the Clyde, for a long distance, has been their boundary line, and, if they did cross it to make war with the Celts, they never came much inland from that line.

Then we come to the cairns, which, in our parish, have been proved in most instances to be places of burial. These were very numerous; in fact, I may safely say, the parish has been thoroughly studded with them,

PLATE I.

FIG. 1.

STONE CELT FOUND AT AUCHMEDDAN, LESMAHAGOW.

FIG. 2.

BRONZE CELT FOUND AT DUNSIDE, LESMAHAGOW.

FIG. 3.

STONE IMPLEMENT FOUND AT CUMBERHEAD, LESMAHAGOW.

so much so that as many as four could be counted on a farm of a hundred acres. One of these cairns covered half an acre of land and stood fifty feet high, and in the centre were several stone cists and also an urn which crumbled away when exposed to the atmosphere. This was on the farm of Waterhead (Mr. Steel's). During the present year, in removing part of the foundation of this cairn, another cist was unearthed, with bones, a few of which I have here with me.

The next largest cairn which I know of stood on the farm of Birkhill (Mr. Smith). This cairn, when removed, contained 1,400 carts of stones. Other thirteen cairns were in the same field. Cairns also stood on Blackhill, Dillarhill, Borlandhill, Langside, Corehouse, Knocken, Muirsland, East Balgray; several on Auchrobert, Birkenhead, Yonderton, Skellyhill, etc.; all of which were places of burial, and all the implements found in and around these cairns prove them to have been of Celtic origin.

I have brought some of the implements found in different parts of the parish for your inspection.

The arrow-heads are from Waterhead; the flint spear-head from Brackenridge; these were found by Mr. Steel. Of the stone Celts, one was found at Auchmeddan (Plate I., Fig. 1), one at Waterhead, one at Starbirns, one at Holmhead, and one at Auchenheath. Then there is a variety from Mr. Tudhope, Lesmahagow, a man who has spent a lifetime in collecting relics of the past, and who knows much in connection with the covenanting struggles. They consist of a stone celt found at Birkwoodmains, one from Townfoot, a bronze celt from Dunside (Plate I., Fig. 2), pounding-stone from Hillside, and a flailstone from Cleuchbrae. I have also brought from his collection a fibula, or brooch, of the fourteenth century. This was found on the farm of Barnhills. Mr. Birch said of it: "An interesting fibula of silver, with plain flat circle and short pin, about one and a quarter inch in diameter, the side of the circle inscribed in capital letters of the fourteenth century, badly designed, and, in some cases, mistakenly used:

O.— IHESVS NAZARENV[S]
R.— AVE MARIA ORA PRO NOBIS."

The names of places go a long way in proving the history of a locality, and Lesmahagow names are, to a large degree, Celtic in their origin. For instance, Auchtykernel, Auchnotroile, Auchtygemmel, Auchlochan, Auchren, Auchrobert, Auchinleck, Auchtyfardle, Auchenheath, Auchtool, Auchinbegg, Ardoch, Cumyris or Cumberhead, Clenoch, Corrox, Carnygoyle, Culter-shogle, Cairngower, Devonburn, etc. Such is a brief outline of three of the strongest proofs possible that the Romans never had a strong footing with us, viz., the places of burial, the number of stone and flint implements, and the names of the various places.

Now, while we have a parish so full of Celtic remains, ought it not to be a good hunting-ground for the archæologist?

To the geologist the upper reaches of the parish were made famous by our late and ever to be remembered Dr. Slimon, who was the discoverer of the Silurian system, of whom Sir R. Murchison said, after having visited the doctor: "I came last night from the Lesmahagow country, where I passed two entire days with the good Slimon. We had glorious weather. I am more satisfied with my general results than anything I have seen for many a day. The merit of this discovery is Slimon's, and I shall raise a statue to him for it."

And what Dr. Slimon did for us in geology the late Mr. Greenshields of Kerse did for us in archæology, in writing the *Annals* of the parish; but many things have been unearthed since then which go to make it more interesting than ever. And that brings me to the subject of my paper, viz., "Recent Archæological Discoveries in the Parish of Lesmahagow."

Well, to begin. The place where I was born is named Knocken, about a quarter of a mile from the village, and signifies a little hill. On this little hill, a few years ago, the Upper Ward District Committee of the County Council had occasion to open a quarry for road metal. I was certain something would be found there, and, immediately tirring operations were started, I was there as much as possible.

The result was, in a day or two, a stone cist was unearthed, with the bones inside, in a fair state of preservation. In the cist there was an urn which I have here with me (Plate II., Fig. 1). After this I asked leave of the contractor to search the ground in front of the workmen, which I

PLATE II.

FIG. 1.

FIG. 2.

FIG. 3.

URNS FOUND AT KNOCKEN, LESMAHAGOW.

did, and found all along the face of the little hill stone cists with bones calcined, numbering at that time fifteen or sixteen. All the urns found, however, were other two (Plate II., Figs. 2 and 3), and no implement of any description was found except an old pipe-head, which is also here.

At various times since then I have unearthed cists, but found no more urns. The cists were all found on the face of the little hill, several yards from the top, and that brings me to draw your attention to another very interesting discovery at this same place. On the very top of the knoll, while digging, about four months ago, with Mr. Clarkson, we unearthed a place laid with flagstones and built on either side with dry stone from eighteen inches to two feet high. It was two feet four inches wide at the one end; the other end was built round and circled, and would be three feet six inches wide; the length was seven feet. On the top of the flagstones was a black material, from one inch to four inches thick, mixed with char and small pieces of bone, portions of which I have here for your inspection. I have also brought a drawing of the place as it stood, which may help to give you an idea of what I mean.

I am sorry this place was not allowed to stand. The quarrymen were requested to leave it until those who knew more of these things than I could be communicated with and brought to see it, but greed for gold caused one of them to tear up the flagstones, expecting, no doubt, his fortune was lying underneath. In digging around this place we came upon several flagstones, all having bones underneath. The bones were mostly jaw-bones and were shown to Professor Young, who said they were the jaw-bones of sheep, and sheep of the first year.

At first I thought it might have been the place where they cremated their dead, but, after finding so many animal remains, I now think it must have been where sacrifices for the dead were offered. I am sorry the bones found in the cists (which were human) were not preserved. Professor Young says they would have been of much interest to him.

Within the last fortnight another burying-ground, or tumulus, was explored on this farm of Blackhill. Mr. Smith informs me the proper name of this farm is Dularg, which is black hill. Tradition has it that a battle was fought here, and that this was the place where the dead were buried.

The truth of this I do not know. What I wished to ascertain was if it was really a tumulus. The matter was mentioned to Mr. Hamilton, of the British Linen Bank, who gave me two workmen to assist in opening the mound. The farmer, when liberty was asked to break ground, said we were mad, as he had never heard of it being a place of burial, and did not believe it to be such. We, however, started operations, and wrought very hard for three days, with the following results: We found nothing to prove it to be either Celtic or Roman, but we found abundant evidence that it had been a place of burial, and that the bodies were buried in a wholesale manner. The mound, or tumulus, was perfectly round, and, where nothing had been taken from it, stood at least ten feet high, and measured eighty-one feet in diameter. At one time it would stand much higher, there being no fence to keep cattle from traversing it at pleasure.

The first thing we did was to cut a trench right through it to see of what it was composed, or how it was made up, with the following result: At the base and tapering towards the summit was a wall of clay and small stones, twelve feet thick; this was right round it. All within this twelve feet wall was a rich fat soil and pieces of bone, and on the top had been laid a layer of pretty large stones. Professor Young says this black soil is remains, and if such is the case, and of that I think there is no doubt whatever, there must have been a very large number of people buried here This tumulus has been constructed with a great amount of labour and made to measure. This is the only tumulus which is known to exist in the parish of Lesmahagow, and within two hundred yards of it stands the only megalithic monolith, or great standing stone, in our district. It stands fully six feet high above ground, and is sunk about four feet. A similar stone stood in the adjoining field, but was removed some years ago, and is lying at the side of a fence close by. Another stood a short distance from this on the farm of Clarkston. Mr. Smith, writing to me, says, "This stone was destroyed by Mr. Prentice's shearers. A local rhyme, given in Chambers's *Rhymes of Scotland*, is as follows:

'Between Dillerhill and Crossford
There lies Kate Neavin's hoard.'

James Prentice persuaded the shearers that they would get a treasure below it, and they broke it down, daring the devil, who was said to protect it, to harm them if he could. Mrs. Leiper, who is a grand-daughter of Mr. Prentice, says the field in which the stone stood is still known as the 'Deil Stane Park.'"

I am sorry nothing was found in opening this tumulus which would indicate more directly to what period it belonged, but this is a faithful description of its construction. On the top of the hill, at the foot of which is this tumulus, stands the remnant of a small British camp with a fosse, but much dilapidated and difficult to examine. It is only thirty-five feet in diameter to the outer fosse. This is one of the things which would lead me to think the tumulus to be the result of a battle.

I now come to what may interest you more than cairns or tumuli, viz., showing you a stone implement which was found this year on the farm of South Cumberhead, Lesmahagow (Plate I., Fig. 3). It was found by a drainer, and is now the property of Mr. Hamilton, British Linen Bank House. I think you will admit it is a stranger to anything seen in the past. It has been well made, but would be unwieldy to handle unless with both hands. Where this implement was found the place is called "Castle Dauphin," but why it has such a name no one can tell. On the same farm, at a place named Catcleuch, four stone cists with remains were found, and Mr. Hamilton, who is present, may in course of time be able to unearth something, as he is a gentleman who neither spares time nor labour in making investigations, and he is tenant of the farm.

In concluding this paper, I would say I have dealt almost entirely with the stone and bronze periods, as in and around our cairns and tumuli little else than stone and bronze implements have been found; but you must not for a single moment think that these exhaust our store of relics of the past, some of which may interest you at a future time.

No. XIV.

ANNUAL EXCURSION OF THE SOCIETY, FOR 1897.

THE Excursion took place on Tuesday, 7th September, the day's programme including Linlithgow, Torphichen, Abercorn, and Dalmeny Church. About forty members were present, including John Honeyman, R.S.A., Ex-President; J. O. Mitchell, LL.D., Vice-President; George Neilson, F.S.A. Scot.; P. Macgregor Chalmers, F.S.A.Scot.; J. Dalrymple Duncan, F.S.A. Lond. and Scot., Hon. Secretary; Dr. Mackinlay; A. W. Gray Buchanan of Parkhill; Colonel Stirling of Gargunnock; James Caldwell, F.S.A.Scot.; Alexander Drew; W. F. Salmon, F.R.I.B.A.; John Edwards, F.S.A.Scot.; R. Y. Pickering; William Anderson, F.S.A.Scot.; John Coubrough; John Munn, C.A.; W. A. Donnelly; D. S. Miller; Walter Easton; A. B. Dick-Cleland of Ravenswood; Dr. Henry Dyer; Walter E. Wingate; Andrew Smith (Lanark); D. MacRitchie, F.S.A.Scot.; John Annan; C. R. Cowie; John Aitken; James Bell; W. Anderson Baillie; T. A. Warrand; J. S. Fleming; F. F. Sandford; Rev. Ernest Scott; Rev. D. Young; etc.

The excursion party left Queen Street Station at 9 a.m., and on arriving at Linlithgow were driven to Torphichen, where the Society examined with much interest the remains of the church of the Knights Hospitallers at that place. The remains consist of the north and south transepts with a square central tower. Both the nave and choir have been destroyed, the present parish church of Torphichen standing on the site of the former. Over the transept, and in the tower, are a number of apartments which were occupied as living rooms. Mr. John Edwards, F.S.A.Scot., read a

paper descriptive of the buildings, and of the history of the Order of the Hospital in Scotland.

Returning to Linlithgow, a visit was paid to the ruins of the palace, which were carefully inspected, and a paper on their history was read by Mr. J. Dalrymple Duncan, F.S.A.Lond. and Scot., as follows:—I shall not enter into any detailed notice of the speculations regarding the derivation of the word "Linlithgow," merely mentioning that Mr. Johnstone, in his recent work on Scottish Place-names, supposes it to be derived from the Celtic words "Llyn," "lled," and "cw," meaning respectively "a lake," "wide," and "dear," or the dear, broad lake. It appears quite settled that Linlithgow is not the "Lindum" of Ptolemy, but it may be safely assumed that its site was from a very early period to a greater or less extent a centre of population. It has been commonly stated that during the occupation of the district by the Romans one of their forts stood on the area now occupied by the ruins of the palace, and that fort, it is said, was connected with the line of the Antonine Wall by a road which joined the latter at a point near where Callander House now stands. As, however, no remains of Roman architecture have been discovered in the immediate vicinity, it appears very doubtful whether there is any ground for the popular belief. It is, however, quite certain that Linlithgow was a place of some note as far back as the reign of David I., as we find that that monarch had a castle and manor here, and that the Abbot and Canons of Holyrood obtained from him a grant of all the hides and skins of the cattle and sheep slaughtered in the latter, while the adjacent village had, even at this early period, attained to the dignity of a king's town in demesne, which answered in almost all respects to what came to be termed later a royal burgh. It is probable also that the neighbouring church was founded in this reign, to which we owe the origin of so many of our finest ecclesiastical structures.

We next hear of Linlithgow in 1301, in which year, according to Fordoun, Edward I. of England constituted it his headquarters, and built there a strong castle ("a pele mickill and stark," Barbour calls it), in which through the mediation of Philip of France he subsequently made a truce with the Scots. In 1305, after the betrayal and execution of Wallace, when Edward

had, as he doubtless thought, wholly extinguished any aspirations of the Scots for their former independence, he withdrew to England, leaving a Gascon knight, Pierre Labaud, in command of the castle. It remained in the hands of the English till 1313, when it was taken by the ingenious stratagem of a patriotic farmer of the neighbourhood, William Bunnock or Binnie. Under pretence of conveying hay to the garrison Bunnock drove a loaded waggon, in which eight armed men were concealed, under the gate-way of the fortress, thereby preventing the portcullis from being lowered to its full extent until the little band had been reinforced by comrades who were lying in ambush outside. The garrison, completely taken by surprise, were overpowered, and surrendered at discretion. King Robert forthwith ordered the castle to be demolished, but if this was done a new castle must have been erected either by himself or David II., or by the English in their brief investment of the district during the usurpation of Edward Baliol, as in 1350 a certain John Cairns was given a life-rent of the park round the castle on condition of his making some necessary repairs on the edifice. It has been supposed that the three small towers outside the north-west corner of the present palace which serve to support the buttresses of the west wall date from the time of Edward I., but Messrs. M'Gibbon and Ross take the view that they are later in their origin, and were merely part of the defences of an outer ward.

Although during the reigns of the earlier Stuarts, Linlithgow Palace had not attained the high rank as a royal residence it afterwards reached, we nevertheless find that it was an occasional residence of both Robert II. and Robert III., the former of whom held a Parliament here in 1388, and the latter another in 1399. The town shortly before this had been made one of the "Four Burghs," it and Lanark taking the place of Roxburgh and Berwick, which had been seized by the English.

Serious damage having been caused to the castle of Linlithgow by a fire which took place in 1424, steps were at once taken by James I. for the rebuilding of the edifice in a style more in consonance with the ideas of the age. The work was continued by James II., by whom, in 1449, the palace and lordship were settled on his wife, Mary of Gueldres. The west side, as we at present see it, appears to date from this period, as

probably also did the original north side, which was taken down in the beginning of the seventeenth century.

It being his mother's principal dower-house, it was natural that no inconsiderable part of the minority of James III. should be passed here under the supervision of the worthy Bishop Kennedy, and it was within its walls that the Queen was enabled to shelter Henry VI. of England for a brief period, when he took refuge in Scotland after being driven from his throne by Edward of York. It was at Linlithgow also, in July, 1466, that the Boyds executed their daring scheme of carrying off the young king as he sat in the Chamberlain's Court, a step which, although it resulted in very great immediate influence to the fortunate family who thus succeeded in obtaining for a time the custody of the royal person, and constituted them virtual dictators of the realm, was yet shortly to result in their utter downfall.

Mindful of the home in which his boyhood had been passed, James III. continued through his luckless life to cherish a strong feeling of affection for Linlithgow, and it is to him, who we know was possessed of much artistic taste, and of whom we are told that "he was much given to the building and repairing of chapels, halls, and gardens," it is probable that much of the ornamentation of the interior is attributable. The south side of the present palace was erected by him from 1488-96.

Despite the ominous associations which must have suggested themselves to the mind of James IV., when he reflected that the faction which had compassed his father's death, and whose puppet he had been, had made Linlithgow their headquarters, and had rendezvoused there on the day succeeding the battle of Sauchie, the palace was a favourite residence of the young king. Here, shortly after his father's death, he and his mistress, Lady Margaret Drummond, lived with much pomp and outward merriment, though possibly his morbid nature was all the time tormented by the upbraidings of his conscience. Hither also he, in 1502, brought his bride, Margaret of England, who, ten years afterwards, here gave birth to James V.

In the adjoining church about this time an attempt of an extraordinary character was made by some doubtless well-meaning persons, who seemed

to have hoped by an apparition intended to pass for the Apostle John to work upon the superstitious feelings of the king and induce him to abandon the expedition into England which he was then contemplating. This personage, in the words of Pitscottie, "came where the King was sitting in his desk at his prayers. But when he saw the King he made him little reverence or salutation, but leaned down groflius on the desk before him and said to him in this manner as after follows: 'Sir King, my mother hath sent me to you, desiring you not to pass at this time, where thou art purposed, for if thou does thou wilt not fare well in thy journey, nor none that passeth with thee. Further, she bade thee mell with no woman nor use their counsell . . . for if thou do it, thou wilt be confounded and brought to shame.'" After he had said this, the chronicler tells us that "the man vanished away as he had been a blink of the sun or a whip of the whirlwind and could no more be seen." We all know how the headstrong monarch treated the warning, and how terribly it was verified, and how tradition relates that after the disastrous end of his expedition, when the rash king had fallen at Flodden in the forefront of the battle, encircled by the flower of his nobility, the consort whom he had neglected in life, sought as she had often done before, the octagonal chamber in which one of the towers of the palace terminates, looking long, anxiously and vainly, for his return.

After Flodden, James V., being little more than a year old, it was found necessary to appoint a regent, and after some hesitation the Duke of Albany, a cousin of the dead king, was chosen. Although more a Frenchman than a Scotsman, and although he regretted much his enforced absence from the delights of Paris, the kingdom was fairly well governed under the Regent.

During his rule, the attempted assassination of William Meldrum of Binns, a gentleman of Fife, by the then Stirling of Keir and his brother, took place. As the intended victim defended himself stoutly, and De la Bastie, the Regent's lieutenant, roused by the clamour, came quickly on the scene, the Stirlings fled to Linlithgow, and overpowering the slender guard, seized the palace. The indefatigable lieutenant, one of the most brilliant soldiers of his age, though he was destined to die a

dog's death in after years at the hands of a band of brutal mosstroopers, hotly pursued them, besieged the palace, and captured Keir and his brother, whom he conveyed to Edinburgh, where they were tried and condemned for the crime.

As, however, Albany latterly fell into great disfavour, the young king, on attaining the age of puberty, was made to choose three curators, the Earls of Angus, Argyle, and Errol. Angus, the most powerful of the three, having been fortunate enough to be able to arrange an alliance with Arran, the head of the great rival house of Hamilton, had sufficient influence to get the person of the king into his own sole possession. The power resulting from this was so great that the Douglasses guarded their prize with the utmost vigilance and circumspection, and there seemed very little chance of his being allowed to escape out of their hands, though it was well known that he heartily hated his duresse.

After an attempt to release him by Scott of Buccleuch had proved abortive, the Earl of Lennox, one of the leaders of the Queen-mother's faction, got together an army of 10,000 men, and marched on Edinburgh to endeavour to wrest their treasure from the Douglasses. They were met near Linlithgow in September, 1526, by Angus's allies, the Hamiltons, under their chief, and the Douglasses subsequently coming up, the battle which took place resulted in the total defeat of Lennox's army, while he himself was slain in cold blood after the contest was ended by Sir James Hamilton of Fynnart, commonly known as the Bastard of Arran. The king, who was a spectator of the fray, and whose undisguised sympathy with the foes of his guardians had caused him to be warned that before he should be taken he would be torn in pieces between the opposing forces, despatched Sir Andrew Wood to stay the slaughter which was taking place. He arrived in time to save the life of the Earl of Glencairn, but on reaching the other wing came up only to find the victorious Arran weeping over the corpse of his nephew, Lennox, whom he was styling the wisest, best, and bravest of Scotsmen. Having received a wound in the action and been taken prisoner, Lennox was being conducted to a place of safety by John Hamilton of Bardowie when they encountered

Fynnart, who savagely slew the Earl. The spot where he fell was long marked by a cairn, and so much beloved was he by his men that one of them followed the murderer to Edinburgh, and attempted to assassinate him within the precincts of Holyrood.

After the battle, the victorious Douglasses and Hamiltons returned to Linlithgow, bringing with them the king, whose undisguised grief at the turn affairs had taken must have formed a great contrast to the exuberant joy of his guardians.

It may not be out of place here to sketch shortly the life of the remarkable man whom I have just mentioned, and whose name is inseparably connected with the building in which we are now met. James Hamilton was an illegitimate son of the 1st Earl of Arran, who bestowed on him while yet a young man the Barony of Fynnart in Renfrewshire, and had him legitimated by letters passing the Great Seal on 20th January, 1512. As a reward for the slaughter of Lennox above narrated, Angus bestowed on him the Captaincy of Linlithgow Palace, and James, in whose eyes that truculent deed does not seem to have appeared of great moment, took a very great liking to him, and appointed him, first, Cupbearer and Steward of the Royal Household, and subsequently Superintendent of the Royal Palaces and Castles. Developing a very marked architectural skill, under his directions the Palaces of Linlithgow and Falkland were largely added to, and the later portions of Edinburgh, Stirling, and Rothesay Castles were erected from his designs. He became very wealthy by Royal grants of land and otherwise, and possessed castles and residences in many parts of the kingdom, among which may be mentioned Craignethan—the Tillietudlem of Sir Walter Scott—part of which was built by him.

It is said that regardless of the benefits which had been showered upon him by the Royal hands, he twice endeavoured to compass the death of the king, once by shooting at him from Linlithgow Palace, and on another occasion at Holyrood. Being tried and convicted of these crimes he was beheaded in 1540, and his great estates annexed by the Crown The king is said to have had many disquieting visions, and to have been troubled by remorse (it is difficult to see on what ground) in conse-

quence of the death of his old favourite, whose downfall caused a great sensation throughout the kingdom.

As I have already remarked, great alterations and improvements were made on the Palace in this reign. Many of these were gone on with in anticipation of the union of James V. and the Princess Madeleine of France, which took place in 1537, although it was fated that the young bride was never to see the changes which had been made in her honour. The east and south sides were completely remodelled, and the Great or Parliament Hall or Lyon Chamber was erected on the foundations of an older structure, though it is maintained by some that the latter had been begun by James IV. and was only finished by his successor. The fine fountain in the centre of the court and the gateway at the head of the Kirkgate were also built about this time. The latter originally bore four panels, containing respectively representations of the insignia of the Orders of St. Michael, the Golden Fleece, the Garter, and the Thistle, the three first-named orders having been conferred on James V. by the King of France, the Emperor of Germany, and Henry the VIII. of England, while the last owed its institution to him. Modern reproductions of these have been inserted in the gateway as we at present see it. The death of Queen Madeleine, upon whose young life a rapid consumption was preying even at the time of her marriage, and who only survived her removal to the cold north about a month, rendered the preparations which had been made at Linlithgow in her honour useless for the time, though they doubtless subsequently served to furnish forth the palace so as most favourably to impress Marie de Guise, whom James married in 1538, and brought hither shortly afterwards, drawing from her the remark (accustomed as she must have been to the stately *châteaux* of her native land) that she had never seen a more princely palace. It was probably this saying of his queen that suggested to Sir David Lindsay the putting into the mouth of the dying "Papingo" the statement that "Lithgow's Palace" might be "ane pattern in Portugal or France."

In January, 1540, Sir David's *Satyre of the Three Estates* was produced at Linlithgow before the royal pair, and called forth high encomiums.

Marie de Guise never wavered in her affection for the edifice which

had so taken her youthful fancy. It ever remained her favourite residence, and it was within its walls that on the 7th December, 1542, she gave birth to her fair but ill-starred daughter, who, like another Helen, was destined to bring calamity "where e'er she came." Little did James V. realize when he lay dying at Falkland, broken-hearted in consequence of the rout of Solway Moss, that in the "lass" of whom he spoke so contemptuously, and whose advent added to his grief, the fame of his brilliant race was to culminate and die down, never again to shine forth with the old lustre, while the beauty, talents, and misfortunes of his daughter and the question of her innocence or guilt would afford a theme of fruitful dissertation to poets, historians, and novelists to all time.

After her father's death, Parliament decided that the infant queen should reside either at Linlithgow or Stirling, as the Queen-Dowager might prefer; and she did remain at the former for a few months, when she and her mother were carried off to Stirling.

Parliaments were held at Linlithgow in September, October, and December, 1545, and a Provincial Council in 1552.

In 1559 the Lords of the Congregation visited Linlithgow and demolished all the images in the church, sparing only that of St. Michael, the patron saint of the town, possibly at the intercession of the burghers.

Only passing visits to the palace were made by Queen Mary, though one is memorable, as on returning it was made the occasion of her capture and abduction by Bothwell, an event which changed the whole current of her after-life.

One of the most remarkable incidents in the history of Linlithgow took place on 19th January, 1570—the murder of the Regent Moray by Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh. The Regent was going from Stirling to Edinburgh at the time, and had lodged the night before in Linlithgow, probably in the palace. It is said he had received warning that an attempt to assassinate him was to be made, but paid little heed to it, though it is maintained by some that he changed the line of his route, and that Hamilton, having received private information of the change of plan, made the necessary alterations in his arrangements. Moray was well received by the burghers, and, as the crowd was great and the street narrow, was compelled to move

at a slow pace. Bothwellhaugh was thus enabled to take careful aim, and despite the disadvantages of the clumsy fire-arms of the day, managed to inflict a mortal wound by a musket bullet fired from the window of a house which was said to belong to Archbishop Hamilton. I shall not enter into the vexed question of whether the murderer committed the foul act on account of a private wrong done him by a follower of the Regent, or whether he was a willing tool in the hands of the chief of his name, who, it was well known, being of the Queen's party, regarded the Regent with intense dislike. As the assassin had taken every precaution in making his arrangements he escaped, although he was hotly pursued for miles by the Regent's retainers. The house from which the shot was fired was forthwith burned to the ground. Its site was a portion of the area now covered by the new County Buildings and jail. The Regent, who at once recognized the fatal nature of his injury, was borne to the palace, where he expired about eleven o'clock that night. A gloomy and dismal chamber on the south side of the courtyard is still pointed out as the apartment in which his ambitious soul took its flight.

Linlithgow being to some extent the headquarters of the Queen's party, suffered very severely after the battle of Langside, the victors in that engagement descending on the town and burning the Duke of Chatelherault's mansion there, as well as many of the houses belonging to such persons as were known to sympathize with their unfortunate sovereign.

The palace was a favourite abode of James VI., and at his marriage with the Princess Anne of Denmark it and the land appertaining thereto were, as had been done at the marriage of every Scots monarch for generations, settled on the bride as a dower.

Two Parliaments again met here in 1585 and 1593 respectively, and in 1596 the palace afforded a harbour of refuge to the king from the Edinburgh riots of that year.

By the union of the crowns in 1603, and the departure of James VI. to London, the former close connection of royalty with Linlithgow was abruptly terminated.

Four years afterwards the north side of the palace fell in, and it remained in this condition till the king revisited Scotland in 1617 and

made a progress to Linlithgow, when he ordered its re-erection, and also made alterations on the west side. It has been sometimes supposed that Inigo Jones was the architect, but this is unlikely, and it was most probably the work of William Wallace, the architect of Heriot's Hospital, who then held the office of Royal Master Mason, and was a man of excellent ability.

In 1633 Charles I. came north to the "ancient kingdom," and paid a brief visit to the home of his ancestors at Linlithgow, which was got into order for his reception. The burghers put themselves to great expense to receive his Majesty in a befitting manner. Mr. Waldie, in his valuable *History of Linlithgow*, inserts a curious excerpt from the minutes of a meeting of the Town Council, held on 7th June, 1633, forbidding any persons to wear blue bonnets or plaids during the king's stay in Scotland under penalty of confiscation of the offending article of attire. A thatched house in the Kirkgate was also ordered to be slated, as it was deemed "unseemly and a disgrace to the toun."

In 1646, when Edinburgh was scourged by the plague, the university was removed to Linlithgow for a short period and accommodated in the church, while in the same year a meeting of parliament was held for the last time in the palace.

A small garrison was placed in the palace by Cromwell as he passed through the town on the way to Stirling after his victory at Dunbar, and the soldiers were not withdrawn till November, 1659.

In 1661 Linlithgow was rendered notorious by the public burning at its Market-cross, with much pomp and circumstance, of the Solemn League and Covenant,—the Earl of Linlithgow, the magistrates, and a Mr. Ramsay, then curate of the parish, and afterwards Bishop of Dunblane, being present.

In 1681 James VII., then Duke of York, was sumptuously entertained by the magistrates, and for many years afterwards the town was oppressed by the burden of a heavy debt incurred in connection with the festivities in his honour.

Again, when Prince Charles Edward marched through Linlithgow in 1745 on his way to the south, an effort was made by certain of the

Jacobites in the neighbourhood, and he was entertained to a banquet in the old home of his race, upon which occasion the well in the centre of the quadrangle, which had so often previously run wine in like circumstances in honour of various members of the ill-starred House of Stuart, was made to do so for the last time.

The palace continued to be habitable till January, 1746, when, it is not quite settled whether by accident or intention, General Hawley's dragoons, who were in pursuit of the retreating army of Charles Edward, and had been quartered in the hall on the north side of the quadrangle, on departing left their fires in such a condition that a conflagration took place, and as it was difficult, in consequence of the showers of melted lead which fell from the roof, to approach near enough to extinguish the flames, the building was reduced to the condition of ruin and disrepair in which it has ever since remained. It is said that the Hanoverian general did not evince any anxiety to preserve the palace from destruction, and that when Mrs. Gordon, the keeper, complained of the carelessness of the soldiers, and asked assistance to extinguish the flames, which had even then begun to assume a menacing aspect, he turned a deaf ear to her remonstrances and entreaties, upon which she left him with the taunt that his men displayed the alacrity in getting away from fire which uniformly characterized their movements upon other occasions, alluding to the disgraceful stampedes of which the English cavalry had been guilty whenever they had encountered the Highlanders. It is quite possible that Hawley looked with some degree of satisfaction on the destruction of an edifice which was so inseparably bound up with the traditions of the ancient race, whose descendant was then making the last throw in his brilliant though unsuccessful attempt to regain for his father the throne of his ancestors.

Since that unfortunate event the palace has been nothing more than a picturesque ruin, but the multifarious associations which cluster round it, the fact that it was for centuries the favourite residence of our monarchs, and that so many of our most important national councils were held within its now mouldering walls, and the remarkable extent to which it has figured in connection with some of the most noticeable events in

the history of Scotland, must ever render it one of the most s
interesting objects of antiquity which our country contains.

A vote of thanks having been awarded to Mr. Dalrymple
his paper, the Society passed to the adjoining church of St.
which an examination was made under the guidance of Mr. John
R.S.A., and the Rev. John Ferguson, the parish minister.

Mr. Honeyman said that the church of Linlithgow was u
the finest parish church in Scotland. There was indeed only
of the period which could be compared with it, namely, St. Gile
in Edinburgh. These two churches were about the same length,
Giles' covered a larger area; but the design of Linlithgow C
the more symmetrical and the better proportioned of the two. U
at present its beautiful proportions were marred by the plaster ce
in the form of sham groined vaulting, came a long way down
wallhead. The removal of this ceiling was part of the restor
which could not be carried out at present for want of funds.
was erected during the latter half of the fifteenth century,
interesting example of the difference between the architecture
and Scotland at that time, as we find in it none of the ch
details of the perpendicular style except the tracery of windo
apse and tower, both of which appear to have been additions.
was dedicated to St. Michael—a fact which tends to lend pro
the supposition that the hill on which it stands was the site o
station of considerable importance, as at Inveresk, where the
also dedicated to St. Michael. The church had been badly used
allowed to become roofless, and its present condition showed how
it was to protect our ancient buildings by roofing them. Th
between the condition of the stone-work outside and inside this
very instructive, and he would strongly advise that every mediaev
which would carry a roof should be roofed. Such buildings as
Abbey, Iona Cathedral, etc., not to go further, the palace b
could not be preserved unless they were roofed. St. Michael's wa
in the beginning of the present century, and then great mischief

A partition was built across the church at the west side of the transept, the chancel arch was taken down, and the whole area east from the new partition was filled with galleries and narrow, uncomfortable pews to accommodate as many people as possible. The chancel was greatly disfigured and the masonry seriously injured, and the effect of the church, as a whole, entirely spoiled. The work done by the Restoration Committee was first the removal of the whitewash from the stonework, then the removal of the partition and all the contents of the chancel: then the repaving of the whole church, the erection of the vestry, the repair of the masonwork, and the erection of new heating apparatus, benches, communion table, etc. The pulpit and the font were the gifts of two generous members of the congregation, Mr. Richard and Mr. Gilkison. What was most urgently wanted now was a new roof and the restoration of the old coronal spire on the tower.

After lunching in the Star and Garter Hotel, the Society left Linlithgow by train at 2.15, and, on arriving at Winchburgh Station, were conveyed in carriages to Abercorn, where the fine parish church and the monuments in the churchyard were inspected, and the Rev. J. H. Crawford, minister of Abercorn, read the following notes upon them:—

The church of Abercorn stands on the south side of the Forth, a little way inland, about three miles west of Queensferry.

The name Abercorn manifestly means at the mouth of the Cornie, a small stream a mile long, the form Bede uses being Aebercurnig.

The Angles of Northumbria, after Ecgfrid's victory in 672 A.D., had a nominal supremacy over Pictland, and S. Wilfred, desiring to extend Christianity among the Picts, sent Trumuin and some monks to settle at Abercorn before 680. Trumuin was made Bishop of the Picts, his diocese lying northward. The church then built would be of wood and wattles, and probably perished by fire after the Pictish victory at Dunnichen in 685, when Trumuin and his monks were forced to flee to Whitby.

In later times the monastery at Abercorn was in the diocese of Lindisfarn, which, at the union of Picts and Scots in the ninth century, included most of Linlithgowshire. A Culdee settlement fixed itself at Abercorn, and as Dunkeld held the primacy of the Columban

Church, the church of Abercorn remained in the possession of the See of Dunkeld.

The manor of Abercorn belonged in David I.'s time to Robert Avenel; and in 1176 there was a dispute between his descendant, John Avenel, and the Bishop of Dunkeld, as to the patronage of the church of Abercorn. The bishop gained his point, and henceforth the church was served by a *vicar*, who was one of the *regular* clergy, and probably held no long tenure of the office. Many other Scottish parishes were so ministered to, where the tithes were held by a bishop or monastery.

The Grahams, Mures, Douglases, Hamiltons (now Duke of Abercorn), Setons (now Baronet of Abercorn), held the manor before the present possessors, the Hopes.

The church is Norman in style.

The nave is 57 feet long. It has been largely restored, as it underwent several degradations in the way of repair, the last being very bad in 1838, when the carved oak pews were removed to give place to rough pine. These have been replaced by suitable pews in conformity with the character of the church. The south door is interesting: with the usual toothed ornament in the arch, it has a peculiar tympanum. There is a south transept, built by the Dalzells of Binns, on the site of an earlier lady chapel: the family used to be buried here.

The chancel is 42 feet long and contains two tombstones, in front of which the altar stood, one being of the Hamiltons of Midhope Castle (afterwards possessed by the Drummonds and then the Livingstones). The sanctus belfry still stands above the chancel arch. To the north of the chancel is joined a structure (dating from beginning of eighteenth century) containing the burial vault of the Hopetoun family, and private rooms, with a staircase leading into the gallery pew, which occupies the east end of chancel. The wood carving and panelling are good.

A face is sculptured outside on the north-east corner of the chancel wall, which suggests twelfth century work; the east gable has a step in the wall towards the top, where the wall is not so thick.

The old bell was placed in the Free Church in 1843; it is of seventeenth century workmanship. It was succeeded by one taken at the battle

of Copenhagen, which, becoming cracked, was replaced by a modern bell, and a peal of four bells has since been added.

The old pulpit of 1637 is still preserved, as also the common coffins used for burial two centuries ago. The sculptured stones include hog-backed stones; three Celtic crosses incomplete, the largest figured in Stuart; two commemorative stones, one with a mace-like crosier, and the other with a circle-enclosed cross of twelve arms, the shaft standing on three steps, and having a chalice by its side. All these stones except two were discovered only three years ago.

The church has been recently restored; the chancel arch replaced, an organ gallery (west) constructed, and the west door built instead of a quasi-Elizabethan door of 1838; but the walls have been left as far as possible untouched.

Mr. Crawford having been thanked for his paper, the members then drove through the grounds of Hopetoun House to Dalmeny, when a visit was paid to the parish church, which is an interesting specimen of the Norman period of architecture. Nothing seems to be known of the circumstances in which it came to be erected. The original portions of the edifice are the nave, chancel, and apse, the addition on the north, containing a gallery, porch, and staircase, being modern.

The nave is 42 feet long, the chancel 16 feet, the former being divided from the latter by an arch of three orders, decorated with elaborate chevron ornament. The hood-moulding enclosing the arch, and the soffit of the latter, are also enriched with carving. The arch is supported on each side by three shafts, which have cushion cups and plain bases.

The chancel is vaulted, the ribs of the groining being enriched with chevron ornament. It has a semi-circular apse, entered by an arch of two orders enriched with chevron ornament. The hood-moulding has a facetted ornamentation. The pillars supporting the arch are similar to those of the chancel, and the vaulting is of the same character.

The exterior of the chancel and apse is adorned with a boldly-projecting cornice, supported on corbels carved into grotesque heads, and a string course of a floral pattern runs under the windows. The side walls of

the chancel have been carried up in the form of a parapet to the height of the nave walls.

The principal feature of the building is the south portal. This is of two orders, with a carved hood-moulding surmounted by an arcade of interlacing arches, above which is a corbel course carved into grotesque heads. There are two columns on each side of the porch, the outer round, the inner octagonal. These have rich capitals, the abaci of the latter being part of the string course.

The inner order has thirteen voussoirs with quaint designs. The outer order has eight projecting grotesque heads alternating with voussoirs carved into their designs. There are two detached figures on each side of the arch.

The Society dined together in the Hawes Inn, South Queensferry, under the presidency of Mr. Honeyman, R.S.A., and returned to Glasgow later in the evening.

INDEX.

PAGE

Abercorn Church, Visit of the Society to 517
——— Notes by the Rev. J. H. Crawford on 517
Alexander II. of Scotland, Invasion of Cumberland by 275
Alexander III. of Scotland, Threatened Invasion of the Isle of Man by . . . 277
Ancient Monuments, Local authorities as guardians of 52
——— The law as to injury to 67
——— The preservation and protection of, in Britain . . 1, 26, 45
——— in other countries . . 30
Ancient Monuments Protection Act, The 28
Anne of Denmark, wife of James VI., Notes on a Precept of Infeftment by, as Lady Dunfermline, 1601 167
Archæology a Science 1
Archæological Discoveries, Recent, in the Parish of Lesmahagow 498
——— Survey of the United Kingdom, An 1, 7
——— Surveys in India and on the Continent 8
Auchterarder, Cultus of St. Kessog at 356
Authorship of the "Kingis Quair," The 93

Bede, *De Mensibus Anglorum* 479
Bibliographical Notes on Histories of Inventions and Books of Secrets. Second Supplement 175
Do., do., do., Third Supplement 360
Birdoswald (Amboglanna), Visit of the Society to 240
Boniface VIII., Pope, Recall of Edward I. from Scotland by 301
Bronze Celt discovered in Lesmahagow Parish 499
Brown, J. T. T. The Authorship of the "Kingis Quair" 93
Bute, Visit of the Society to 241

Cærlaverock Castle, Siege of, 1300 296
Cairns discovered in the Parish of Lesmahagow 498

PAGE
Carlisle, Occupation of, by David I. of Scotland 272
——— Visit of the Society to 238
Cathedral, Glasgow, The Hall of the Vicars Choral 77
Celts, Stone and Bronze, discovered in Lesmahagow Parish 499
Chalice, Note on the 214
——— Varieties of the Ecclesiastical 215
Chalices, Grave 225
Chalmers, P. Macgregor, F.S.A. Scot. Supplementary Note to Archbishop Eyre's paper on the Hall of the Vicars Choral, Glasgow Cathedral 88
Chibourn, Northumberland, Statement of Income and Expenditure of Preceptory of 323
Christmas, Yule and. Their Place in the Germanic Year 426
Cists discovered in the Parish of Lesmahagow 500
Clement, St., The Legend of 235
Cooke, T. Etherington. Notes on a Precept of Infeftment granted by Anne of Denmark, wife of James VI., as Lady Dunfermline 167
Court of Love, The 116, 156
Covenant, Two Champions of the 340
Crawford, The Rev. J. H. Notes on Abercorn Church 517
Cumberland, Invasion of, by Alexander II. of Scotland 275
Cup, Brass, found in the Graveyard of the Church of St. Clement, Rodil, Harris . 214

Dalmeny Church, Visit of the Society to 519
David I. of Scotland, Occupation of Carlisle by 272
Drymen, Chapel of St. Kessog at 355
Dunagoil Vitrified Fort, Bute, Visit of the Society to 241
Duncan, J. Dalrymple, F.S.A. Lond. and Scot. Historical Notes on Linlithgow Palace 505
Dunfermline, Notes on a Precept of Infeftment by Anne of Denmark, wife of James VI., as Lady Dunfermline, in Subjects in 167
——— Seal of the Lordship of 171

Edward I., Campaigns of, in Scotland, in 1296, 1297, and 1298 290
——— Fleet of, in Scotland 297
——— Order of Recall from Scotland addressed to, by Boniface VIII. . . . 301
——— Last years of 306
——— Residence of, at Torphichen, 1298 317
Edwards, John, F.S.A. Scot. Torphichen and the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem in Scotland 309
Equinoxes, Solstices and, in the Germanic Year 448
Excursion, Annual, of the Society, for 1895 238
——— for 1896 241
——— for 1897 504
Eyre, The Most Rev. Archbishop, LL.D., D.D. The Hall of the Vicars Choral, Glasgow Cathedral 77

PAGE

Ferguson, John, LL.D., F.S.A. Lond, and Scot., Regius Professor of Chemistry in the University of Glasgow. Bibliographical Notes on Histories of Inventions and Books of Secrets. Second Supplement 175
Do., do., do., Third Supplement 360

Germanic Year, The 426
——— The Beginning of the 442
——— The Place of Yule and Christmas in the 426
——— Solstices and Equinoxes in the 448
Glasgow Cathedral, The Hall of the Vicars Choral 77
Glasgow. Property in Stockwell Street belonging to Knights of St. John of Jerusalem 338

Hadrian, Wall of, Visit of the Society to Portions of the 240
Hall of the Vicars Choral, The, Glasgow Cathedral 77
Hepburn, John, Minister of Urr 342
——— March of, on Dumfries, 1715. 345
Histories of Inventions and Books of Secrets, Bibliographical Notes on. Second Supplement 175
Do., do., do., (Third Supplement) 360
Hoddom, Dumfriesshire. St. Mungo's first seat as Bishop in Scotland . . . 249
Honeyman, John, R.S.A. Observations on Linlithgow Church 516
Hospitallers, The Knights. *Vide* Knights of St. John of Jerusalem.

Inch-ta-vannach, Loch Lomond. Reputed abode of St. Kessog 352
Infeftment, Notes on a Precept of, granted by Anne of Denmark, wife of James VI., as Lady Dunfermline 167

James I. of Scotland, The Question of his Authorship of the "Kingis Quair" . . 93
——— The Wooing of, and Lady Joan Beaufort 159
January, Calends of, Introduction of the commencement of the year with the . . 457
Jordanhill Estate, formerly property of Knights of St. John of Jerusalem . . . 339

Kessog, St., and his Cultus in Scotland 347
——— Bells of 358
——— Chapel of, at Drymen 355
——— in Kilmaronock Parish 355
——— Cultus of, at Auchterarder 356
——— Well dedicated to, in Strathblane Parish 354
"Kingis Quair," The Authorship of the 93
——— The Dialect and Grammar of the 154
Knights Hospitallers. *Vide* Knights of St. John of Jerusalem.
Knights of St. John of Jerusalem in Scotland, The 309
——— Estates in Scotland belonging to the . 337

PAGE

Knights of St. John of Jerusalem in Scotland, Property in Stockwell Street, Glasgow, belonging to the 338
——— The Acquisition by the, of the property of the Templars 321
——— Jordanhill Estate formerly Property of 339
Knight Templars, Acquisition of the Property of the, by the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem 321

Lanercost Priory, Visit of the Society to 240
Langalchorad, Bute, Standing Stones of, Visit of the Society to 241
Lesmahagow, Recent Archæological Discoveries in the Parish of 498
Linlithgow Church, Visit of the Society to 516
——— Observations by John Honeyman, R.S.A., on 516
——— Palace, Visit of the Society to 504
——— Historical Notes on 505
Lochmabenstane, The 254

Mackinlay, James Murray, F.S.A., Lond. and Scot. St. Kessog and his Cultus in Scotland 347
Macmillan, John, Minister of Balmaghie 341
Man, Isle of, Threatened Invasion of, by Alexander III. of Scotland . . . 277
Marches, Laws of the, 1249-92, ... 278
Monuments, Ancient, The Preservation and Protection of, in Britain . . 1, 26, 45
——— in other countries . . 30
——— The Law as to Injury to 67
Mungo, St., first Bishop at Hoddom, Dumfriesshire 249
Murray, David, LL.D., F.S.A. An Archæological Survey of the United Kingdom. The Preservation and Protection of Ancient Monuments 1
——— Note on a Small Brass Cup found in the Graveyard of the Church of St. Clement, Rodil, Harris, with a Note on the Chalice 214
Museums of Antiquities, National and Local 53

Naworth Castle, Visit of the Society to 240
Neilson, George, F.S.A. Scot. Annals of the Solway until A.D. 1307 . . . 245
Norse Invasions of the Solway District 264

Preservation and Protection of Ancient Monuments, The, in Britain . . 1, 26, 45
——— in other countries . . 30

"Quair, Kingis," The Authorship of the 93
——— The Dialect and Grammar of the 154

Rodil, Harris, The Church of St. Clement at 233
——— Note on a Small Brass Cup found in the Graveyard of 214

PAGE

Rothesay Castle, Visit of the Society to 243

St. Blane's Chapel, Bute, Visit of the Society to 242
St. Clement, The Legend of 235
St. Kessog and his Cultus in Scotland 347
——— Bells of 358
——— Chapel of, in Drymen Parish 355
——— in Kilmaronock Parish 355
——— Cultus of, at Auchterarder 356
——— Well dedicated to, in Strathblane Parish 354
St. Mungo, first Bishop at Hoddom, Dumfriesshire 249
Saltmaking on the Solway 280
Sanctuary, Privilege of, attached to Preceptory of Torphichen 333
Sandilands, Sir James, last Preceptor of the Order of Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, Grant of Barony of Torphichen to 336
Secrets, Books of, Bibliographical Notes on Histories of Inventions and. Second Supplement 175
Do., do., do., Third Supplement 360
Skeat, Professor. The Authorship of the "Kingis Quair" 108, 117
Solway, The, Annals of, until A.D. 1307 245
——— during Roman occupation 247
——— after the departure of the Romans 248
——— Etymological and Historical Details 252
——— Geographical Rise and Progress of the Term 259
——— as a Boundary, 1092-1157 271
——— Norse Invasions of the District 264
——— Salmon Fishings on 287
——— Saltmaking on 280
Standing Stones of Langalchorad, Bute, Visit of the Society to 241
Stockwell Street, Glasgow, Property in, belonging to Knights of St. John of Jerusalem 338
Stone Celts discovered in Lesmahagow Parish 499
——— Implement discovered at South Cumberhead, Lesmahagow 503
Story, The Rev. R. Herbert, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Glasgow. Two Champions of the Covenant 340
Strathblane, Well dedicated to St. Kessog 354
Survey, An Archæological, of the United Kingdom 1, 7
——— Nature of 14

Templars, The Knight, Acquisition of the Property of, by the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem 321
Thomsen, Christian 2
"Three-age-system," The 3
Tille, Alexander, Ph.D. Yule and Christmas: Their Place in the Germanic Year . 426

PAGE

Torphichen and the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem in Scotland 309
——— Grant of Barony of, to Sir James Sandilands 36
——— Privilege of Sanctuary attached to Preceptory of 333
——— Visit of the Society to 504
Treasure Trove 35
——— The Law as to 69
Tumulus discovered at Blackhill, in the Parish of Lesmahagow 501

Urns discovered in Lesmahagow Parish 500, 501

Vicars Choral, The Hall of the, Glasgow Cathedral 77
Vitrified Fort, Dunagoil, Bute, Visit of the Society to 242

Wall of Hadrian, Visit of the Society to Portions of the 240
Wallace, Sir William, Residence of, at Torphichen, 1298 317

Year, The Germanic, The Place of Yule and Christmas in 426
—— The Beginning of the Anglo-German 442
—— Introduction of the Commencement of the, with the Calends of January . 457
Young, James. Recent Archæological Discoveries in the Parish of Lesmahagow . 498
Yule and Christmas: Their Place in the Germanic Year 426

THE END.

1899

Glasgow Archæological Society.

REPORT

BY THE COUNCIL

PRESENTED 15TH NOVEMBER, 1896.

FOR SESSION 1895-96.

WITH

ABSTRACT OF TREASURER'S ACCOUNTS; AND
LIST OF MEMBERS AS AT 31ST DECEMBER, 1896,
ETC.

ROOMS OF THE SOCIETY 207 BATH STREET.

GLASGOW:
PUBLISHED FOR THE SOCIETY BY
JAMES MACLEHOSE & SONS, ST. VINCENT STREET,
Publishers to the University.
1896.

Glasgow Archæological Society.

REPORT BY THE COUNCIL

FOR SESSION 1895-96.

DURING the past Session six meetings were held, and the following papers were read:—

1895.

Nov. 21.—Opening Address, by David Murray, LL.D., F.S.A. Lond. and Scot., President of the Society.

Dec. 19.—(1) "The Hall of the Vicars Choral of Glasgow Cathedral," by the Most Reverend Archbishop Eyre, D.D., LL.D.

(2) "A Medallion found at Delvin, Perthshire: an Archæological Puzzle," by James Paton, F.L.S.

1896.

Jan. 11.—(1) "The Parish of St. Peter of Houston," by J. M. Mackinlay, F.S.A. Scot.

(2) "Biographical Notices of (*a*) Bishop William Elphinstone; (*b*) Archbishop James Law; (*c*) Robert Carrick of Braco, and others," by John Oswald Mitchell, LL.D., Vice-President.

Feb. 20.—(1) "Note on a Brass Cup found in the Churchyard of Rodel, in the Island of Harris," by David Murray, LL.D.

(2) "A Journey in Greece in the Autumn of 1895," by Ronald M. Burrows, M.A. Oxon.

March 10.—(1) "The Authorship of the Kingis Quair: a new Criticism," by J. T. T. Brown, Esq.

(2) "Notes on a Precept of Infeftment granted by Anne, wife of James VI., as Lady Dunfermline, 1601," by J. Etherington Cooke, Esq.

(3) "The Seal of Cause by the Magistrates of Glasgow constituting the Society of Painters in Glasgow, dated 31st August, 1773," by J. Dalrymple Duncan, F.S.A. Lond. and Scot.

April 16.—(1) "The Antiquities and Folk Lore of the Island of Seil and Luing and of the Summer Isles," by W. Ivison Macadam, F.C.S., F.S.A. Scot.

(2) "Excavations at Castle Law, Abernethy," by Alexander Mackie.

There were also exhibited during the Session:—

(1) "Bernardo Bembo's Manuscript Commonplace Book, 1471-1518," by George Neilson, F.S.A. Scot.

(2) "Bronze Socket Celt from Dol, Brittany; and Bronze Flanged Celt found at Gartocharn, Kilmaronock, Dumbartonshire," by Charles E. Whitelaw, Esq.

(3) "Collection of Prehistoric Remains chiefly from the Medway," by T. F. Tannahill, M.B., C.M., D.P.H. (Camb.).

(4) "Precept of Infeftment" referred to in Mr. Etherington Cooke's paper, by Francis H. Newbery, Esq.

(5) "Seal of Cause," referred to in paper, by J. Dalrymple Duncan, F.S.A. Lond. and Scot.

(6) "Copy of the Seal of an Abbot of Dundrennan found on the lands of Maxwell of Mulloch, the last bailiff of Dundrennan," by John Honeyman, R.S.A.

The Annual Excursion of the Society was this year made on 4th September to Bute, when, under the guidance of the Rev. J. King Hewison, F.S.A. Scot., the Standing Stones of Langalchorad, the Vitrified Fort of Dunagoil, the Ruins of the old Church of St. Blane, the Monuments in the old Chapel of St. Mary, Rothesay, and Rothesay Castle, were successively visited. The Society observed with pleasure the steps which are being taken by the Marquis of Bute to preserve the remains at St. Blane.

The members dined together in the Royal Hotel, under the presidency of Mr. Honeyman, R.S.A.

During the past Session, the concluding part of the second of the new series of the Society's transactions was issued. It is proposed to issue the first part of the third series during the present Session. It will contain the following papers:—

1. Introductory Address, by David Murray, LL.D.
2. "The Hall of the Vicars Choral, Glasgow Cathedral," by Archbishop Eyre, D.D., LL.D., with Supplementary Note by P. Macgregor Chalmers, F.S.A. Scot.
3. "The Authorship of the Kingis Quair: a new Criticism," by J. T. T. Brown, Esq.
4. "Bibliographical Notes on Histories of Inventions and Books of Secrets." First supplement. By Professor Ferguson, LL.D.
5. "Notes on a Precept of Infeftment granted by Anne, wife of James VI., as Lady Dunfermline, 1601," by T. Etherington Cooke, Esq.
6. "Note on a Brass Cup found in the Churchyard of Rodel, in the Island of Harris," by David Murray, LL.D.
7. Accounts of the Annual Excursions for 1895 and 1896.

The number of members admitted in 1895-96 was nine, including one Honorary Member.

The Council are glad to record that steps are being taken which may lead to an arrangement for the effectual preservation of some of the most interesting sections of the Antonine Wall.

The Report of the Council's Committee upon the research in the line of the Antonine Wall only awaits the completion of the necessary drawings to be issued. The greater portion of the work is already in type.

The Council record with satisfaction that the proposal made by Mr. F. T. Barrett in his paper on "Local Place Names" available for the Civic Wards of Glasgow, which was read on 18th April, 1895, has been to a very considerable extent given effect to in the selection of names for the new Municipal Wards of Glasgow.

The Council think it worthy of mention in this Report that, by the terms of The Light Railways Act, 1896, § 22, it is provided that "if any

objection to any application for authorizing a light railway is made to the Light Railway Commissioners, or if any objection to any draft order is made to the Board of Trade *on the ground that the proposed undertaking will destroy or injure any building or other object of historical interest*, or will injuriously affect any natural scenery, the Commissioners and the Board of Trade respectively shall consider any such objection, and give to those by whom it is made a proper opportunity of being heard in support of it." This will give a much needed *locus standi* in such inquiries to Archæological Societies, and be beneficial in preserving the antiquities of the country.

The Council have to acknowledge, with thanks, the receipt of the following volumes:—

1. From the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, U.S.A.:—
   Thirteenth Annual Report of Bureau of Ethnology. Published 1896.
2. The Anthropological Society of Washington:—
   American Anthropologist (Quarterly).
3. The Glasgow Philosophical Society:—
   Proceedings. Vol. XXVI. 1895.
4. The Society of Antiquaries of Scotland:—
   (*a*) Account of excavation of Birrens. 1896.
   (*b*) Proceedings. Third Series. Vol. V. 1896.
5. The Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland:—
   (*a*) Journal. As published.
   (*b*) Report. 1896.
6. The Royal Society of Antiquaries of London:—
   Proceedings. Vol. XV., No. 4. 1895. Vol. XVI., No. 1. 1896.
7. The Shropshire Archæological and Natural History Society:—
   Transactions. Second Series. Vol. VII., Part 3. 1895. Vol. VIII., Parts 1 and 2. 1896.
8. The British and American Archæological Society of Rome:—
   Journal as published.
9. The Cambridge Antiquarian Society:—
   (*a*) Proceedings. No. XXXVII. 1896.
   (*b*) List of Members. 1896.

10. The Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society :—
Transactions for Session 1894-95. 1896.

11. The Royal Swedish Antiquarian Academy, Stockholm :—
Antiqvarisk Tidskrift för Svenige. Parts as published.

12. Hrivatskoga Starinarskog Druztva of Kninu :—
Starohrvatska Prosvjeta. God. XI. Br. 1 and 2.

13. The British Association for the Advancement of Science :—
Report. 1895.

14. F. M. Von Donat. The Author :—
"The Pontine Marshes." A Lecture. 1895 (3 copies).

15. L'Université Royale de Norvige, Christiania :—
Symbolæ ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam, by Dr. Ludovico Daae. 1888.

16. Glasgow Corporation :—
Report of Kelvingrove Museum and Corporation Galleries. 1895.

17. The Board of Trustees of the Public Museum of the City of Milwaukee :—
Thirteenth Annual Report. Published 1895.

18. The Directors of Stirling's and Glasgow Public Library :—
Report. 1896.

19. Museo Nacional, San Jose, Costa Rica :—
(*a*) Informe presentado al señor Secretario de Estado en el despacho de Fomento por Antasasio Alfaro, Administrador del Museo. 1896.
(*b*) Antiqüedades de Costa Rica por Anastasio Alfaro, 1896.
(*c*) Documentos relativos a la participacion de Costa Rica en Dicho Certamen. No. 1. 1896.

20. A. D. Weld French, 160 State Street, Boston, Mass. The Author :—
"County Records of the Surnames of Francis, Franceis, French, in England, A.D. 1100-1350." Boston, 1896.

21. William G. Don, M.D., 52 Confield Gardens, West Hampstead, London, N.W. The Author :—
"Archæological Notes on Early Scotland." Brechin. 1896.

22. The Society of Architects, London :—
Journal. New Series. Vol. III.

At the beginning of the last Session, Mr. James Marwick, who had for ten years filled the office of Honorary Treasurer, intimated his resignation in consequence of his residence abroad, and Mr. George J. Walker, C.A., was elected his successor in that office.

The Council recommend the re-election of the Most Reverend Archbishop Eyre, LL.D., D.D., John Oswald Mitchell, LL.D., and the Rev. Professor Story, D.D., as Vice-Presidents. Messrs. David Robertson, F.S.A. Scot., George Neilson, F.S.A. Scot., and J. B. Murdoch, F.S.A. Scot, retire at this term, and Mr. William Jolly, F.L.S., has expressed his desire to retire owing to ill health. The election of the retiring Councillors is recommended, along with those of Mr. J. Dalrymple Duncan, F.S.A. Lond. and Scot., and Mr. William George Black, F.S.A. Scot., as Honorary Secretaries, and of Mr. George J. Walker, C.A., as Honorary Treasurer, and the election of Mr. J. T. T. Brown in room of Mr. Jolly is also recommended. The Society owes much to Mr. Jolly, who in many branches of archæological study has not alone stimulated research, but has made many valuable contributions to historical studies.

The Council also desire to express the Society's obligation to Mr. John R. Donald, C.A., and Mr. John Edwards, F.S.A. Scot., for acting as Honorary Auditors during the past year. They recommend the election for this year of Messrs. William Ewing and James D. Roberton.

For, and on behalf of the Council,

JA. DALRYMPLE DUNCAN, } *Hon.*
WILLIAM GEORGE BLACK, } *Secs.*

EXCERPT FROM MINUTE of the Fortieth Annual Meeting of the Society, held on 19th November, 1896.

DAVID MURRAY, LL.D., President, in the Chair.

The Annual Report of the Council was read by Mr. William George Black, F.S.A.Scot. Hon. Secretary. On the motion of the President, seconded by John Honeyman, R.S.A., the Report was adopted.

The Hon. Treasurer's Statement was submitted on behalf of Mr. George J. Walker, C.A., by Mr. Edward Hutchison, C.A. On the motion of the President, seconded by Mr. James D. Roberton, F.S.A.Scot., the Statement was adopted, subject to audit.

TREASURER'S STATEMENT

AND

LIST OF OFFICE-BEARERS AND MEMBERS.

GLASGOW ARCHÆOLOGICAL SOCIETY—ABSTRACT OF THE

Dr.

To Funds at close of last Account :—												
(1) Subscriptions in arrear—												
3 for Session 1891-92,							£1	11	6			
8 for Session 1892-93,							4	4	0			
9 for Session 1893-94,				£5	12	6						
Less paid to account,				0	10	6						
							5	2	0			
40 for Session 1894-95,							25	0	0			
							£35	17	6			
(2) Invested Funds—												
£216 9s. 4d. 2¾ per cent. Consols (Life Membership Subscription Fund),							210	0	0			
(3) Cash in Bank—												
On Account Current,				£37	2	4						
On Deposit Receipt—												
Ordinary Funds,	£50	0	0									
Life Membership Subscription Fund,	52	10	0									
Sir Michael Connal's Legacy,	3	7	6									
				105	17	6						
							142	19	10			
(4) Cash in hands of Treasurer,							1	6	7			
										£390	3	11
,, Bequest (by the late Sir Michael Connal) further to account, *less* duty,										2	5	0
,, Publication of Transactions :—												
Received from Sale of Transactions,										2	7	8
,, Revenue :—												
(1) Subscriptions—												
264 for Session 1895-96,							£165	0	0			
Deduct amount paid in advance last year,							1	17	6			
							£163	2	6			
Add 2 Subscriptions for Session 1896-97,							1	5	0			
							£164	7	6			
(2) Dividends and Interest—												
Consols,				£5	15	4						
Interest accrued on Deposit Receipts,				1	3	10						
							6	19	2			
										171	6	8
										£566	3	3

HON. TREASURER'S INTROMISSIONS FOR SESSION 1895-96.

| | | |

OFFICE-BEARERS

OF THE

Glasgow Archaeological Society,

INSTITUTED 1856.

SESSION 1896-97.

President.—DAVID MURRAY, LL.D., F.S.A. Lond. and Scot.

Vice-Presidents.

THE MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP EYRE, LL.D., D.D.

JOHN OSWALD MITCHELL, LL.D.

THE VERY REV. PROFESSOR STORY, D.D.

Council.

JOHN HONEYMAN, R.S.A.

PROFESSOR YOUNG, M.D.

J. T. T. BROWN.

P. MACGREGOR CHALMERS, F.S.A.Scot.

ROBERT GUY.

PROFESSOR FERGUSON, LL.D.

F. T. BARRETT.

PROFESSOR LINDSAY, D.D.

JAS. M. MACKINLAY, F.S.A.Scot.

PROFESSOR G. G. A. MURRAY, M.A.

SIR J. STIRLING-MAXWELL, BART., M.P.

DAVID ROBERTSON, F.S.A.Scot.

GEORGE NEILSON, F.S.A.Scot.

J. B. MURDOCH, F.S.A.Scot.

JAMES MACDONALD, LL.D.

Honorary Secretaries.

J. DALRYMPLE DUNCAN, F.S.A.Lond. and Scot., 211 Hope Street.

WILLIAM GEORGE BLACK, F.S.A.Scot., 88 West Regent Street.

Honorary Treasurer.

GEO. J. WALKER, C.A., 150 St. Vincent Street.

Honorary Librarian.

GEORGE NEILSON, F.S.A.Scot.

Honorary Auditors.

WILLIAM EWING. | JAS. D. ROBERTON.

Members who desire to read papers, or who have objects of Archæological interest to exhibit, are requested to communicate with the Honorary Secretaries. Ladies are invited to attend all meetings.

Forms of application for admission to the Society may be had from the Honorary Secretaries.

Payment of the Annual Subscription is requested to be made to the Honorary Treasurer. No publication will be sent to Members who have not paid the Subscription for the year corresponding to such publication.

The Annual Excursion will take place in Autumn, and during the Session a series of Monthly Excursions to places of Archæological interest in the neighbourhood of Glasgow may be arranged for on the Saturdays immediately following the monthly meetings, and will be announced in the billet.

LIST OF MEMBERS.

SESSION 1896-97.

Honorary Members.

	Date of Admission
Birch, Walter de Gray, F.R.S.L., F.S.A., British Museum, London.	1881
Bute, The Most Honourable the Marquess of, K.T., Mount Stuart, Rothesay.	1881
Evans, Sir John, K.C.B., D.C.L., Nash Mills, Hemel-Hempstead.	1892
Ferguson, The Worshipful Chancellor, F.S.A., Carlisle.	1895
Gomme, George Laurence, F.S.A., 24 Dorset Square, London, N.W.	1881
Lothian, The Most Honourable the Marquess of, K.T., Newbattle Abbey, Dalkeith.	1881
Mitchell, Sir Arthur, K.C.B., M.D., LL.D., 43 Drummond Place, Edinburgh.	1881

Ordinary Members as at 31st December, 1896.

(*) Indicates Members of Council. (†) Indicates Life Members.
(‡) Indicates that the Member was admitted prior to the resuscitation of the Society in 1877.

Adam, Thomas, Hazel Bank, Uddingston.	1879
Addie, John, Viewpark, Uddingston.	1889
Aiken, John B., 201 West George Street.	1891
Aitken, James A., 116 Mains Street.	1893
Aitken, John, 328 St. George's Road.	1891
Alexander, D. M., 97 West Regent Street.	1892
Allan, F. W., 125 Buchanan Street.	1884
Allan, James, Woodend, Helensburgh.	1887
Alston, W. M., C.E., 24 Sardinia Terrace, Hillhead.	1887
Anderson, Councillor Robert, 76 Bath Street.	1892
Anderson, William, F.S.A.Scot., Arns-Brae, New Kilpatrick.	1894
Anderson, William Boyd, 4 Grosvenor Crescent, Kelvinside.	1882
Anderson, W. F. G., 22 Huntly Gardens.	1886

	Date of Admission.
Annan, John, 37 Garnethill Street.	1892
Arthur, Matthew, 78 Queen Street.	1883
†Arthur, Thomas Glen, 78 Queen Street.	1883
Baillie, William Anderson, Glentore, Uddingston.	1889
Baird, J. G. A., M.P., Adamton, Ayrshire.	1891
Balfour, D. D., Sheriff-Substitute of Lanarkshire, County Buildings.	1882
Barnwell, Richard, Elcho House, Balfron.	1888
Barr, Henry, 45 West George Street.	1894
*Barrett, F. T., Librarian, Mitchell Library.	1882
Beckett, Charles E., M.A., LL.B., 163 St. Vincent Street.	1896
Bell, Dugald, 27 Lansdowne Crescent.	1883
†Bell, Sir James, Bart., 7 Marlborough Terrace.	1892
Bell, James, Springbank, Hamilton.	1892
†Bell, James T., Northcote, Dowanhill Gardens.	1892
Berry, Sheriff, LL.D., 5 University Gardens.	1888
Beyaert, The Rev. Arthur, Kirkintilloch.	1894
Bilsland, William, F.S.A.Scot., 28 Park Circus.	1895
*Black, William George, F.S.A.Scot., 88 West Regent Street, *Hon. Sec.*	1877
Blackie, J. Robertson, Northbank, Dowanhill Gardens.	1890
Blyth, Robert, 1 Montgomerie Crescent, Kelvinside.	1891
Blythswood, The Right Hon. Lord, LL.D., Blythswood, Renfrew.	1885
Boyd, David T., 19 Wellington Street.	1890
Boyle, A. H., Ruchill House, Maryhill.	1891
Brand, James, C.E., 11 Windsor Circus, Kelvinside.	1891
Brand, James, 10 Marchmont Terrace, Kelvinside.	1889
Bremner, R. L., 11 West Regent Street.	1895
Brogan, Antony D., Anthonbrae, Cambridge Drive, Kelvinside.	1884
Brown, Charles, Kerse, near Falkirk.	1893
*Brown, J. T. T., 97 West Regent Street.	1891
Brown, Robert, 17 Hope Street.	1889
Brownlie, Archibald, of Monkcastle, Bank of Scotland, Barrhead.	1889

	Date of Admission.
Bruce, John, 67 West Nile Street.	1888
Brydall, Robert, F.S.A.Scot., 8 Newton Terrace.	1890
†Bryden, R. Lockhart, B.L., 15 Dalhousie Street.	1893
Buchanan, A. W. Gray, of Parkhall, Polmont.	1895
†Bulloch, Matthew, 48 Prince's Gate, London, S.W.	1883
Burnet, James M., 24 George Square.	1893
Burnet, John, I.A., St. Kilda, Dowanhill Gardens.	‡
Burnet, John James, I.A., F.S.A.Scot., 167 St. Vincent Street.	1882
†Burns, John William, of Kilmahew, Cardross.	1889
Burrows, Ronald M., 21 Kelvinside Terrace, South.	1894
Caldwell, James, F.S.A.Scot., Writer, Paisley.	‡
Cameron, John, Southbank House, Kirkintilloch.	1892
Cameron, John M'Callum, M.B., Glenlee, Dalmuir.	1892
Campbell, Angus, 48 West Regent Street.	1891
Campbell, D. A., 40 Lawrence Street, Partick.	1892
Campbell, J. Archibald, 167 St. Vincent Street.	1885
Campbell, James, of Tullichewan, 137 Ingram Street.	‡
†Campbell, James A., M.P., LL.D., Stracathro, by Brechin.	‡
Campbell, John MacNaught, Kelvingrove Museum.	1881
Campbell, R. C., Graham, Shirvan, Lochgilphead, N.B.	1890
†Cayzer, C. W., M.P., Ralston, Renfrewshire.	1884
*Chalmers, P. Macgregor, F.S.A.Scot., 95 Bath Street.	1889
Charleson, Rev. J., The Manse, Thornliebank.	1895
Christie, T. Craig, of Bedlay, by Chryston.	1885
Church, W. R. M., C.A., 104 West George Street.	1890
Clark, William, Gartfern, High Crosshill, Rutherglen.	1885
Cochran-Patrick, R. W., LL.D., F.S.A.Lond. & Scot., Woodside, Beith.	1880
†Colquhoun, Sir James, of Luss, Bart., Dunclutha, Ore, Hastings.	1885
Colquhoun, Councillor James, LL.D., 158 St. Vincent Street.	1884
Cook, William, 77 St. Vincent Street.	1893
Cook, W. B., 28 Queen Street, Stirling.	1884

	Date of Admission.
Coubrough, John, Blanefield, Stirlingshire.	1877
Coulson, J. Laurie, Amalfi, Kelvinside.	1890
Couper, William, Glynnhurst, Blundellsands, Liverpool.	1889
Cowie, Charles R., Woodend, Partick.	1891
Cree, Thomas Scott, 15 Montgomerie Quadrant, Kelvinside.	1888
†Crerar-Gilbert, D. M., Yr. of Yorkhill, 3 Great Western Terrace.	1888
Crouch, William, C.E., 175 Hope Street.	1887
†Curle, R. Barclay, New Club.	1891
Dalrymple, James, of Woodhead, Kirkintilloch.	‡
Dick, David, 7 Seyton Avenue, Langside.	1888
Dick, J. Proudfoot, F.S.A.Scot., Ladycross Lodge, Brockenhurst, Hants.	1880
Dick-Cleland, A. B., of Ravenswood, 28 Coates Gardens, Edinburgh.	1890
Dickson, Jas. S., 97 Bath Street.	1891
†Donald, John R., C.A., 104 West George Street.	1883
†Donald, T. F., C.A., 104 West George Street.	1882
Donnelly, W. A., Middleton House, Milton, by Bowling.	1894
Douglas, Campbell, F.R.I.B.A., 266 St. Vincent Street.	‡
Douglas, William, 22 West Nile Street.	1891
Drew, Alexander, Creggandarroch, Blairmore.	1889
Duncan, J. A., 161 West George Street.	1888
*Duncan, J. Dalrymple, F.S.A.Lond. and Scot., F.R.S.E., 211 Hope Street, *Hon. Secretary*.	1877
Dunlop, Andrew M., 11 Kersland Terrace, Hillhead.	1889
Dunlop, Archibald, 25 Wellington Street.	1884
Dunn, Robt. Hunter, 4 Belmont Crescent, Hillhead.	1885
†Dyer, Henry, C.E., M.A., 8 Highburgh Terrace.	1886
Easton, Walter, 125 Buchanan Street.	1882
Edmiston, John, 41 West Nile Street.	1886
†Edwards, John, F.S.A.Scot., 4 Great Western Terrace, Kelvinside.	1891
Eskdale, John L., 80 Argyle Street.	1891

	Date of Admission.
Ewing, William, 62 Buchanan Street.	1891
*Eyre, The Most Rev. Archbishop, LL.D., D.D., F.S.A.Scot., 6 Bowmont Gardens, Kelvinside, *Vice-President.*	1888
†Faulds, Andrew Wilson, F.S.A.Scot., 111 Union Street.	1882
Faulds, W. B., Westfield, Ibrox.	1893
Ferguson, A. A., 48 M'Alpine Street.	‡
Fergusson, D. S., Ballancleroch, Campsie Glen, N.B.	1891
*†Ferguson, Professor J., LL.D., F.S.A.Lond. and Scot., 13 Newton Place.	1878
Fleming, Alexander, of Kilmaho, 168 West George Street.	1883
Fleming, James, Treasurer, Corporation Gas Department, City Chambers.	1893
†Fleming, James B., of Kelvinside, Beaconsfield, Kelvinside.	1881
Fleming, John, 1 Lynedoch Terrace.	1883
Fotheringham, Thomas Bremner, 65 West Regent Street.	1891
Foulis, Alexander, 180 St. Vincent Street.	1884
†Fowler, John, 5 Derby Street, West.	1884
Fraser, J. W., 168 West George Street.	1886
†Fraser, M. P., LL.B., 27 Merchiston Terrace, Edinburgh.	1883
Fraser, Melville, 31 St. Vincent Place.	1884
Freeman, W. Weber, 145 West Nile Street.	1888
Galbraith, Thomas L., Town-Clerk, Stirling.	1889
Garroway, James R., New Club.	1882
Gemmill, J. Leiper, 162 St. Vincent Street.	1890
Gibson, William, 77 Queen Street.	1885
†Gillies, William, 204 West George Street.	1882
Gordon, The Rev. J. F. S., D.D., Beith.	1891
Gourlay, Robert, Manager, Bank of Scotland, St. Vincent Place.	1888
Gow, Leonard, 19 Waterloo Street.	1889
†Graham, James, LL.D., F.R.S.E., 11 Claremont Terrace.	1891

	Date of Admission.
Graham, James, Jun., 198 West George Street.	1885
Graham, John, C.A., 212 West George Street.	1882
†Graham, Patrick, C.A., 212 West George Street.	1890
†Graham, R. C., of Skipness, Skipness House, Argyllshire.	1888
†Grahame, James, C.A., 93 Hope Street.	1882
Gray, George, 72 Hutcheson Street.	1883
Greig, Andrew, 36 Belmont Gardens, Hillhead.	1882
Grierson, Henry, Craigend Park, Liberton, Edinburgh.	1883
Grieve, W. Weir, 179 W. George Street.	1882
*Guy, Robert, 120 West Regent Street.	1878
Hamilton, Chas. Edw., 1 North Park, Hillhead.	1895
Hedderwick, A. W. H., M.A., 79 St. George's Place.	1883
Henderson, Thomas Beath, M.D., 155 Bath Street.	1894
Herron, Hugh, 157 West George Street.	1883
Hewison, The Rev. J. King, M.A., The Manse, Rothesay.	1891
Heys, Zechariah George, South Arthurlie, Barrhead.	1893
†Hill, William Henry, LL.D., 194 Ingram Street.	‡
Hogg, Charles, P., C.E., 175 Hope Street.	1884
†Hoggan, George B., 194 Ingram Street.	1885
*Honeyman, John, R.S.A., F.R.I.B.A., 140 Bath Street.	‡
Honeyman, P. S., 88 West Regent Street.	1883
†Hunt, John, Fingarry, Milton of Campsie.	1885
Hunter, The Rev. David, D.D., The Manse, Galashiels.	1886
†Hunter, J. R. S., LL.D., Daleville, Carluke.	1891
Hunter, Wm. Sutherland, Kildonan, Maxwell Drive, Pollokshields.	1893
Hurry, Alfred A., 136 Wellington Street.	1884
Hutchison, Thomas H., 4 Windsor Quadrant.	1884
Jameson, Robert, 147 St. Vincent Street.	1885
Johnston, The Rev. A. Orrock, D.D., 3 Bowmont Terrace, Kelvinside.	1878

	Date of Admission.
Johnston, David, 160 West George Street.	1882
Johnstone, William, B.L., City Chambers.	1891
Keith, Duncan, 13 West Regent Street.	1883
Kelvin, The Right Honourable Lord, F.R.S., D.C.L., LL.D., The College.	1893
Kennedy, James, Chesters, New Kilpatrick.	1887
†Keppie, John, 140 Bath Street.	1891
Ker, Charles, C.A., 115 St. Vincent Street.	1887
†Ker, T. Ripley, of Dougalston, Milngavie.	1879
Ker, William D., 140 Hope Street.	1892
Ker, David Smith, 26 Bothwell Street.	1891
Kidston, John, 50 West Regent Street.	1890
Kidston, William, 50 West Regent Street.	1885
Kincaid, Thomas, 9 Lansdowne Crescent.	1889
King, Sir James, of Campsie, Bart., LL.D., 115 Wellington Street.	1883
Kirkpatrick, Andrew J., 179 West George Street.	1893
Knight, Charles A., 21 Bothwell Street.	1886
Laidlaw, Rev. Andrew, 3 Derby Crescent.	1896
Laird, John, 4 North Court, Royal Exchange.	1889
†Lang James, 9 Crown Gardens, Dowanhill.	1883
Lang, William, Cross Park, Partick.	1893
Lindsay, Charles C., C.E., 167 St. Vincent Street.	1894
*Lindsay, The Rev. Professor T. M., D.D., 37 Westbourne Gardens.	1877
Lodge, Professor Richard, M.A., 10 University Gardens.	1895
MacBrayne, David, 17 Exchange Square.	1885
M'Call, James, F.S.A.Scot., 98 West George Street.	1878
M'Cowan, David, 7 Lynedoch Crescent.	1891
Macdonald, Alex., F.S.A.Scot., 9 Montgomerie Drive, Kelvinside.	1881

	Date of Admission.
*Macdonald, James, LL.D., F.S.A.Scot., 49 Fountainhall Road, Edinburgh.	1884
Macfarlane, John, 11 Camphill Quadrant, Langside.	1886
MacGeorge, B. B., 24 George Square.	1882
M'Gregor, James, 8 Kersland Street, Hillhead.	1891
M'Grigor, Alexander, 172 St. Vincent Street.	1883
Macharg, E. Simpson, 69 Buchanan Street.	1885
Mackenzie, Alexander, Writer, Paisley.	1891
†Mackinlay, David, 6 Great Western Terrace.	‡
*†Mackinlay, James M., F.S.A.Scot., 4 Westbourne Gardens.	1886
Mackinlay, Wm. M., 16 Kelvinside Gardens.	1895
Maclae, A. Crum, of Cathkin, 147 St. Vincent Street.	1886
Maclay, D. T., 169 West George Street.	1882
Maclay, James, M.A., LL.B., 169 West George Street.	1888
Maclay, William, 7 Eildon Villas, Mount Florida.	1891
Maclean, Allan, 41 West George Street.	1883
MacLehose, James J., M.A., F.S.A.Scot., 61 St. Vincent Street.	1882
MacLehose, Robert, M.A., 61 St. Vincent Street.	1882
MacLellan, Robert, Conservative Club.	1891
Macnair, Thomas, 27 St. Vincent Place.	1895
Macnaughton, Duncan, I.A., 137 West Regent Street.	1883
Maconechy, Robert, Golf View, Prestwick.	1882
Macquaker, Thomas, 14 Seytoun Avenue, Langside.	1890
Main, John Bell, Park Road, Hamilton.	1891
†Maitland, Sir James R. G., Bart., F.L.S., F.G.S., Sauchie, Stirling.	1892
Mann, John, C.A., 188 St. Vincent Street.	1891
†Marwick, Sir James D., LL.D., City Chambers.	1878
†Menzies, James, Mount Feargan, Bothwell.	1884
Miller, D. S., 8 Royal Crescent.	1881
Mitchell, A. Moncrieff, LL.B., 160 West George Street.	1885
Mitchell, George A., 63 Bath Street.	1884
Mitchell, James, 240 Darnley Street.	1895

	Date of Admission.
†Mitchell, John, 2 Lynedoch Street.	1888
*†Mitchell, John Oswald, LL.D., F.S.A.Scot., 69 East Howard Street, *Vice-President.*	1882
Moore, Robert T., C.E., 13 Clairmont Gardens.	1891
Muir, James, C.A., 149 West George Street.	1885
Muir, Sir John, Bart., 6 Park Gardens.	1889
†Munro, R., M.D., F.S.A.Scot., 48 Manor Place, Edinburgh.	1883
*Murdoch, J. B., F.S.A.Scot., Capelrig, Mearns.	‡
*Murray, David, LL.D., F.S.A.Lond. and Scot., 169 West George Street, *President.*	1881
*Murray, Professor G. G. A., The College.	1890
Murray, John Bruce, 17 University Gardens, Hillhead.	1886
Nairne, J. Stuart, F.R.C.S.E., 197 Pitt Street.	1890
*†Neilson, George, F.S.A.Scot., Central Police Chambers.	1890
Newbery, F. H., School of Art, 264 Sauchiehall Street.	1894
Nicol, Donald N., M.P., Ardmarnock, by Tigh-na-bruaich.	1888
Orr, James Basden, 8 Royal Exchange Buildings.	1891
Orr, John F., 88 St. Vincent Street.	1883
Park, Alexander, Croy House, Croy.	1891
Paterson, Oscar, 118 West Regent Street.	1889
Paton, James, F.L.S., Camphill House, Crossmyloof.	1884
Patterson, A., M.D., 22 India Street.	1882
Pearson, Alexander, Sheriff-Clerk Depute, County Buildings.	1885
Petrie, James A., Clydeville, Bowling.	1885
Pickering, R. Y., Braxfield, Lanark.	1891
Pirrie, Robert, F.S.A.Scot., 9 Buckingham Terrace.	1896
Prentice, Thomas, 175 West George Street.	1890
Provan, James, 40 West Nile Street.	1879

Reid, James A., 172 St. Vincent Street.
Reid, James Drummond, 39 Finlay Drive, Dennistoun.
Reid, Thomas, M.D., 11 Elmbank Street.
Renwick, Robert, Depute Town-Clerk, City Chambers.
Robb, James, Sen., 90 Trongate.
Roberton, James D., 1 Park Terrace, East.
Roberts, Andrew, F.S.A.Scot., 172 St. Vincent Street.
Robertson, The Rev. Alexander, Manse of Haggs, by Bonnybridge.
*Robertson, David, 94 Mitchell Street.
Ross, David, M.A., LL.D., Normal Training College, New City Road.
†Ross, John M., 2 Devonshire Gardens.
Roxburgh, George R., 7 Milton Terrace, Langside.
Ruddock, John W., 41 St. Andrew's Drive, Pollokshields.
Rundell, Richard Cooper, Royal Exchange Buildings.

Salmon, W. Forrest, F.R.I.B.A., 197 St. Vincent Street.
Scott, John, 247 Sauchiehall Street.
†Shand-Harvey, James W., of Castle-Semple, Lochwinnoch.
Shaughnessy, Joseph, Bellevue, Rutherglen.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H., M.P., Carnock, Larbert.
Sinclair, Bailie Alexander, *Glasgow Herald*, Buchanan Street.
Smith, Alexander, 302 Sauchiehall Street.
†Smith, J. Guthrie, 54 West Nile Street.
Somerville, John, 2 Millar Terrace, Rutherglen.
Sorley, Councillor Robert, 1 Buchanan Street.
Spencer, John James, 121 West George Street.
Spencer, Charles Louis, 121 West George Street.
Spens, John A., 169 West George Street.
Stewart, Peter, 141 South York Street.
Stuart, James, C.E., 12 Broomhill Avenue, Partick.
*†Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John, of Pollok, Bart., M.P., F.S.A.Scot., Pollok, Pollokshaws.

	Date of Admission.
Stirling, Colonel, of Gargunnock, Gargunnock House, Stirling.	1890
*Story, The Rev. R. Herbert, D.D., Professor of Church History, Glasgow University, *Vice-President.*	1887
Stout, Thomas, M.A., B.L., 14 Belmont Crescent.	1894
Strachan, R. U., Sheriff-Substitute of Lanarkshire, 9 Crown Circus, Dowanhill.	1896
Sturrock, Peter, of Baltersan, London Road, Kilmarnock.	1890
Swan, Robert M. W., 15 Walmer Crescent.	1893
Thomson, M. C., 25 Hope Street.	1885
Turnbull, George D., 10 India Street.	1883
Turnbull, John, 50 West Regent Street.	1890
Turner, William, Rachan House, Helensburgh.	1883
Ure, George Albert, Hope Park, Bonnybridge, Stirlingshire.	1891
*Walker, Geo. J., C.A., 150 St. Vincent Street, *Hon. Treasurer.*	1895
Walker, Robert, Secretary, Glasgow Fine Art Institute, 175 Sauchiehall Street.	1893
Wallace, T. M., Douglas Gardens, Uddingston.	1884
†Watson, Duncan, 112 Bath Street.	1887
†Watson, T. L., 166 Bath Street.	1881
Watt, The Rev. J. B. A., The Manse, Cawder, by Bishopbriggs.	1888
Weddel, James, Park Villa, Uddingston.	1882
Whitelaw, Alexander, of Gartshore, Kirkintilloch.	1891
†Whitelaw, Chas. E., 168 Bath Street.	1889
Whitelaw, Thomas, 112 Wellington Street.	1886
Whyte, John, Master of Works, City Chambers.	1891
Williamson, George, Municipal Buildings, Wallace Place, Greenock.	1882
Wilson, John, M.P., 75 Bothwell Street.	1887
Wilson, Robert, Procurator-Fiscal, County Buildings, Hamilton.	1885
Wingate, J. B., 102 Hope Street.	‡

	Date of Admission.
Wingate, Walter E., 4 Bowmont Terrace, Kelvinside.	1887
Wood, William J., 38 Cochrane Street.	1894
†Wordie, John, F.S.A.Scot., 42 Montgomerie Drive, Kelvinside.	1884
Young, George Burn, 45 West George Street.	1883
*Young, Professor J., M.D., 38 Cecil Street, Hillhead.	‡
Young, William, R.S.W., 65 West Regent Street.	1896

Past Presidents of the Society since 1877.

1877-80.—The Very Rev. John Caird, D.D., LL.D., Principal of the University of Glasgow.

1880-83.—John Young, M.D., Professor of Geology, University of Glasgow.

1883-86.—John Veitch, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Logic and Rhetoric, University of Glasgow.

1886-88.—The Rev. Thomas M. Lindsay, D.D., Professor of Church History, Free Church College, Glasgow.

1888-91.—John Honeyman, R.S.A., F.R.I.B.A.

1891-94.—John Ferguson, LL.D., F.S.A. Lond. and Scot., Professor of Chemistry, University of Glasgow.

1894-95.—Colin Dunlop Donald, F.S.A.Scot.

GLASGOW: PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
BY ROBERT MACLEHOSE AND CO.

Glasgow Archæological Society.

REPORT

BY THE COUNCIL

PRESENTED 17TH NOVEMBER, 1898.

FOR SESSION 1897-98.

WITH

ABSTRACT OF TREASURER'S ACCOUNTS; AND
LIST OF MEMBERS AS AT 31ST DECEMBER, 1898,
ETC.

ROOMS OF THE SOCIETY, 207 BATH STREET.

GLASGOW:
PUBLISHED FOR THE SOCIETY BY
JAMES MACLEHOSE & SONS, ST. VINCENT STREET,
Publishers to the University.
1898.

Glasgow Archæological Society.

REPORT BY THE COUNCIL
FOR SESSION 1897-98.

During the past Session six meetings were held, and the following papers were read:—

1897.

Nov. 18.—"Museums: their History and their Use," by David Murray, LL.D., President.

Dec. 16.—"Glasgow Cathedral: the Vaulting of the Lower Church," by T. L. Watson, F.R.I.B.A., I.A.

1898.

Jan. 20.—"The History of the Hunter Coin Cabinet," chiefly from unpublished Letters and Accounts in the Hunterian Museum, by George Macdonald, M.A.

Feb. 7.—(1) "Notes relative to two Signed Copies of the Solemn League and Covenant from the Hunterian Museum, one signed by the Members of the University," by Professor Young, M.D.

(2) "Notes and Lists upon the University Copy," by W. Innes Addison, Esq.

Mar. 17.—(1) "Notes on English Receipt Books of the 16th, 17th, and 18th Centuries," by Professor Ferguson, LL.D.

(2) "Robin Carrick's Will," by J. O. Mitchell, LL.D., Vice-President.

Mr. J. J. Spencer exhibited two sets of French Tally-sticks.

April 15.—(1) "The Vaulting of the Lower Church, Glasgow Cathedral: A Criticism of a Recent Theory," by P. Macgregor Chalmers, F.S.A. Scot.

(2) "Notes on a Lease of the Lands of Dryslwyn, Carmarthenshire, under the Great Seal of Elizabeth, 1593," by T. Etherington Cooke. (The Lease was exhibited by Francis H. Newbery, Esq.)

(3) "Some English Receipt Books of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," by Professor Ferguson, LL.D., F.S.A. (with exhibits).

There were also exhibited during the Session—

(1) The Upper Stones of a Quern found in the neighbourhood of Glasgow Green, and some Perforated Stones found in the bed of the Clyde near Rutherglen Bridge; these were exhibited by Mr. John Orr, and described by David Murray, LL.D., President.

The Annual Excursion of the Society was this year made to Torphichen, Linlithgow, Abercorn, and Dalmeny. At Torphichen the interesting ruins of the Preceptory of Knights Hospitallers were examined, and a paper read by Mr. John Edwards, F.S.A. Scot. At Linlithgow the ruins of the Palace were first visited, and a paper on the history of the edifice read by Mr. J. Dalrymple Duncan, F.S.A. Lond. and Scot., after which the party proceeded to the Church of St. Michael, where an account of the recent restoration was given by Mr. John Honeyman, R.S.A., and the Rev. John Ferguson, minister of the parish. After lunch in the Star and Garter Hotel, the party took train to Winchburgh, thence they drove to Abercorn Church, which was described by the Rev. J. H. Crawford. Subsequently the Society drove through the grounds of Hopetoun House to the interesting Church of Dalmeny, one of the finest examples of the Norman period of architecture in Scotland, which was carefully inspected. The party dined in the Hawes Inn, South Queensferry, mentioned in Scott's *Antiquary*, under the presidency of Mr. Honeyman.

The number of members admitted in 1896-97 was 17.

Part I. of the third volume of the second series of the Society's Transactions has been issued. It contains 243 pages, and is the largest part ever issued to members. Part II. will shortly be sent to press; it will contain:—

"Annals of the Solway," by George Neilson, F.S.A. Scot.

"Recent Archæological Discoveries in the Parish of Lesmahagow," by James Young.

"Yule and Christmas: A Study of Germanic Origins," by Alexander Tille, M.A., Ph.D.

"Torphichen and the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem in Scotland," by John Edwards, F.S.A. Scot.

"Two Champions of the Covenant," by Professor Story, D.D., LL.D.

"St. Kessog and his Cultus in Scotland," by J. M. MacKinlay, F.S.A. Lond. and Scot.

"The Vaulting of the Lower Church, Glasgow Cathedral," by P. Macgregor Chalmers, F.S.A. Scot.

"Notes on Histories of Inventions and Books of Secrets" (second supplement), by Professor Ferguson, LL.D.

"Beaugency, St. Benoît-sur-Loire, and Germigny-des-Prés," by J. Dalrymple Duncan, F.S.A. Lond. and Scot., F.R.S.E.

Account of the Annual Excursion of the Society for 1897.

Mr. P. Macgregor Chalmers having now finished the drawings he kindly agreed to make in illustration of the Report of the Society's Committee upon the recent investigations on the line of the Antonine Wall, it is hoped the Report may be published shortly. It will not be issued free to members, but will be sold to them at a considerably lower price than to the general public.

A catalogue of the Society's Library will be issued shortly. It is matter of much regret to the Council that the books cannot be made more accessible to members. The Society is in much need of rooms of its own, where its Library could be properly managed, and facilities afforded for its being readily consulted by members.

The Council acknowledges, with thanks, receipt of the following volumes:—

The Society of Antiquaries of Scotland:—
Proceedings. 1896.

The Royal Society of Antiquaries of London:—
(1) Journal. Vol. VII., Part 3.
(2) Proceedings, as issued.

The Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland:—
Journal. In Parts as published.

The Powysland Club:—
Collections. Vol. XXIX., Part 2.

The Anthropological Society of Washington, U.S.A. :—
The American Anthropologist. In Parts, as published.

The Smithsonian Institution, Washington, U.S.A. :—
(1) Report. 1894.
(2) Report. 1895.
(3) Annual Reports of U.S. National Museum for 1893-94.
(4) Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology. Vol. XIV. Parts 1 and 2 (1892-93).
(5) Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology. Vol. XV. 1894.

Museo Nacional, San Jose, Costa Rica :—
(1) Mamiferos de Costa Rica por Anastasio Alfaro. 1897.
(2) Insectos de Costa Rica por J. Fid Tristan.
(3) Muloscos Terrestres y Fluviatiles de la meseta central de Costa Rica por P. Biolley. 1897.
(4) Documentos relatives a la participacion de Costa Rica en Dicho Certamen. Nos. 6 and 8. 1897.
(5) Informe del Museo Nacional de Costa Rica. 1896-1897.

David Murray, LL.D. The Author :—
An Archæological Survey of the United Kingdom. 1896.

Professor Ronald M. Burrows, M.A. The Author :—
(1) Les Etudes Classiques en Angleterre. 1896.
(2) Do. Do. 1897.
(3) Pylos and Sphacteria. 1897.

The Philosophical Society of Glasgow :—
(1) Proceedings. 1895-96. Vol. XXVII. 1896.
(2) Do. 1896-97. Vol. XXVIII. 1897.

The Norwegian Antiquarian Society :—
(1) Foreningen til Norske Fortidsmindesmerkers Bevaring Aarsberetning for 1894 and 1895. 1895-96.
(2) Stavanger Domkirke ved N. Nicolaysen. 1st Hefte, 1895. 2nd Hefte, 1896.

Royal University of Norway, Christiania :—
(1) Samlede Philologiske Afhandlinger. By Prof. T. O. Schjott.
(2) Norronaskaller. By Justus Barth.

Hrvatskoga Starinarskog Druziva of Kninu :—

(1) Starohrvatska Prosvjeta Glasilo Hrvatskoga Starinarskog Druztva of Kninu. God. II. Br. 3. 1896.

(2) Starohrvatska Prosvjeta Glasilo Hrvatskoga Starinarskog Druztva of Kninu. God. II. Br. 4. 1896.

Donald Currie & Co. :—

Tantallon Castle. The Story of the Castle and the Ship. By E. R. Pennell. 1895.

The Royal Swedish Antiquarian Academy, Stockholm :—

(1) Antiqvarisk Tidscrift för Sverige. In Parts, as issued.

(2) Kongl. Vitterhets Historie och Antiqvitets Akademiens Manadsblad. In Parts. 1892.

Institut Archéologique Liégeois :—

Bulletin de l'Institut Archéologique Liégeois. Vol. XXV. 1896.

The Shropshire Archæological and Natural History Society :—

(1) Transactions. Vol. IX. 1897.

(2) Proceedings. In Parts, as issued.

The British and American Archæological Society of Rome :—

Journal. Vol. II., No. 7. 1896-97.

James Hilton, F.S.A. The Author :—

Chronograms Collected. 1895.

Baillie's Institution Free Library :—

Report. 1896 and 1897.

Robert Renwick, City Chambers. Editor :—

Abstracts of Protocols of the Town Clerks of Glasgow. Vols. I., II., and III.

Aberdeen University :—

Catalogue of the Books in the Celtic Department of the University Library. 1897.

The Society of Architects :—

Journal. New Series. Vol. IV.

Major-General D. J. F. Newall, R.A. The Author :—

The Highlands of India. Vol. II. 1887.

Professor Story, D.D., LL.D. :—
The St. Columba Commemoration, Iona. 9th June, 1897.

The Cambridge Antiquarian Society :—
(1) Biographical Notes on the Librarians of Trinity College on Sir Edward Stanhope's Foundation. By Robert Sinker, D.D. 1897.
(2) Proceedings. No. XXXVIII.
(3) List of Members. 1897.

Glasgow Corporation :—
Report of Museums and Galleries. 1896.

Oneida Historical Society, Utica, N.Y. :—
Transactions. No. 7. 1897.

The Council recommends the re-election of the Most Reverend Archbishop Eyre, D.D., LL.D., John Oswald Mitchell, LL.D., and the Very Reverend Professor Story, D.D., as Vice-Presidents.

Messrs. John Honeyman, Professor Young, and J. T. T. Brown retire at this term, and a vacancy is also caused by the death of Mr. David Robertson. The Council recommends the re-election of the retiring Councillors, and the appointment of Mr. John Edwards, F.S.A. Scot., in room of Mr. Robertson. They also recommend the re-election of Mr. J. Dalrymple Duncan, F.S.A. Lond. and Scot., and Mr. William George Black, F.S.A. Scot., as Honorary Secretaries, and of Mr. George J. Walker, C.A., as Honorary Treasurer.

The Council desires to express the Society's obligations to Messrs. William Ewing and James D. Roberton for acting as Honorary Auditors during the past year.

The Council recommends the election, as Honorary Auditors this year, of Messrs. James Provan and Walter E. Wingate.

In name and by authority of the Council,

JA. DALRYMPLE DUNCAN,
WILLIAM GEORGE BLACK, } *Hon. Secretaries.*

EXCERPT FROM MINUTE of the Forty-Second Annual Meeting of the Society, held on 17th November, 1898.

DAVID MURRAY, LL.D., President, in the Chair.

The Annual Report of the Council was read by Mr. William George Black, F.S.A.Scot., Hon. Secretary. On the motion of the President, seconded by J. O. Mitchell, LL.D., the Report was adopted.

The Hon. Treasurer's Statement was submitted by Mr. George J. Walker, C.A. The Statement was adopted, subject to audit by Messrs. James Muir, C.A., and J. J. Spencer.

TREASURER'S STATEMENT

AND

LIST OF OFFICE-BEARERS AND MEMBERS.

GLASGOW ARCHÆOLOGICAL SOCIETY—ABSTRACT OF THE

Dr.

TO FUNDS AT CLOSE OF LAST ACCOUNT:—				
(1) Subscriptions in Arrear—				
3 for Session 1891-92,			£1 11 6	
6 for Session 1892-93,			3 3 0	
7 for Session 1893-94,	£4 7 6			
Less, paid to account,	0 10 6			
			3 17 0	
21 for Session 1894-95,			13 2 6	
50 for Session 1895-96,			31 5 0	
			£52 19 0	
(2) Invested Funds—				
£216 9s. 4d., 2¾ per cent. Consols (Life Membership Subscription Fund),			210 0 0	
(3) Cash in Bank—				
On Deposit Receipt—				
Ordinary Funds,	£50 0 0			
Life Membership Subscription Fund,	52 10 0			
Sir Michael Connal's Legacy,	3 7 6			
	£105 17 6			
On Account Current—				
Ordinary Funds,	£54 17 8			
Sir Michael Connal's Legacy,	2 5 0			
	57 2 8			
			163 0 2	
(4) Cash in hands of Hon. Treasurer,			11 13 7	
				£437 12 9
,, PUBLICATION OF TRANSACTIONS:—				
Received from Sale of *Transactions*,				0 7 6
,, SPECIAL SUBSCRIPTION:—				
Received Subscription for purpose of Excavating "Rough Castle Camp," Falkirk,				5 0 0
,, LIFE MEMBERSHIP SUBSCRIPTION FUND:—				
Received two Subscriptions to this Fund,				15 15 0
,, REVENUE:—				
(1) Subscriptions—257 for Session 1896-97,			£160 12 6	
Deduct amount paid in advance last year,			1 5 0	
			£159 7 6	
Add 5 Subscriptions for Session 1897-98,			3 2 6	
			£162 10 0	
(2) Dividends and Interest—				
Consols,	£5 15 4			
Interest on Deposit Receipt,	1 10 1			
			7 5 5	
				169 15 5
				£628 10 8

HON. TREASURER'S INTROMISSIONS FOR SESSION 1896-97.

			Cr.
BY EXPENSES OF MANAGEMENT:—			
Printing and Stationery,*			£23 0 9
Salary of Officer,			3 3 0
Advertising,			14 1 5
Rent,			6 0 0
Charge for Addressing Circulars,			1 4 6
Postages and Incidents—			
Per Circulars,	£4 12 8		
Per Secretaries,	2 15 10		
Per Treasurer,	1 2 6		
			8 11 0
Excursion,			1 18 0
Miscellaneous—			
British Record Society, "Index Library,"	£2 0 6		
Photographs,	1 5 0		
Binding Books,	4 19 11		
			8 5 5
			£66 4 1
,, SUBSCRIPTIONS WRITTEN OFF AS IRRECOVERABLE,			8 9 0
,, FUNDS AT CLOSE OF THIS ACCOUNT:—			
(1) Subscriptions in Arrear—			
1 for Session 1891-92,	£0 10 6		
2 for Session 1892-93,	1 1 0		
2 for Session 1893-94,	1 5 0		
8 for Session 1894-95,	5 0 0		
13 for Session 1895-96,	8 2 6		
33 for Session 1896-97,	20 12 6		
	£36 11 6		
(2) Invested Funds—			
Consols (Life Membership Subscription Fund),	210 0 0		
(3) Cash in Bank—			
On Deposit Receipt—			
Ordinary Funds,		£215 0 0	
Life Membership Subscription Fund,		68 5 0	
Sir Michael Connal's Legacy,		5 12 6	
		£288 17 6	
On Current Account,		7 2 8	
	296 0 2		
(4) Cash in hands of Hon. Treasurer,	11 5 11		
			553 17 7
			£628 10 8

* The Printer has not yet rendered his account for Vol. III., Part I., of the *Transactions*. It is estimated to amount to £136.

E. & O. E. GEORGE J. WALKER, *Hon. Treasurer.*

GLASGOW, *27th November*, 1897.—Examined and found to be correct.

(Signed) JAMES PROVAN, ,, W. E. WINGATE, } *Auditors.*

OFFICE-BEARERS

OF THE

Glasgow Archaeological Society,

INSTITUTED 1856.

SESSION 1897-98.

President.

DAVID MURRAY, LL.D., F.S.A.Lond. and Scot.

Vice-Presidents.

THE MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP EYRE, D.D., LL.D.
JOHN OSWALD MITCHELL, LL.D.
THE VERY REV. PROFESSOR STORY, D.D., LL.D.

Council.

P. MACGREGOR CHALMERS, F.S.A.Scot.
ROBERT GUY.
PROFESSOR FERGUSON, LL.D.
F. T. BARRETT.
PROFESSOR LINDSAY, D.D.
JAMES M. MACKINLAY, F.S.A.Lond. and Scot.
PROFESSOR G. G. A. MURRAY, M.A.
SIR JOHN STIRLING-MAXWELL, Bart., M.P.
JOHN EDWARDS, F.S.A.Scot.
GEORGE NEILSON, F.S.A.Scot.
J. B. MURDOCH, F.S.A.Scot.
JAMES MACDONALD, LL.D.
JOHN HONEYMAN, R.S.A.
PROFESSOR YOUNG, M.D.
J. T. T. BROWN.

Honorary Secretaries.

J. DALRYMPLE DUNCAN, F.S.A.Lond. and Scot., 211 Hope Street.
WILLIAM GEORGE BLACK, F.S.A.Scot., 88 West Regent Street.

Honorary Treasurer.

GEORGE J. WALKER, C.A., 150 St. Vincent Street.

Honorary Librarian.

GEORGE NEILSON, F.S.A.Scot.

Honorary Auditors.

JAMES PROVAN. | WALTER E. WINGATE.

Members who desire to read papers, or who have objects of archæological interest to exhibit, are requested to communicate with the Honorary Secretaries. Ladies are invited to attend all meetings.

Forms of application for admission to the Society may be had from the Honorary Secretaries.

Payment of the Annual Subscription is requested to be made to the Honorary Treasurer. No publication will be sent to Members who have not paid the Subscription for the year corresponding to such publication.

The Annual Excursion will take place in Autumn.

LIST OF MEMBERS.

SESSION 1898-99.

Honorary Members.

	Date of Admission
Birch, Walter de Gray, F.R.S.L., F.S.A., British Museum, London.	1881
Bute, The Most Honourable the Marquess of, K.T., Mount Stuart, Rothesay.	1881
Evans, Sir John, K.C.B., D.C.L., Nash Mills, Hemel-Hempstead.	1892
Ferguson, The Worshipful Chancellor, F.S.A., Carlisle.	1895
Gomme, George Laurence, F.S.A., 24 Dorset Square, London, N.W.	1881
Lothian, The Most Honourable the Marquess of, K.T., Newbattle Abbey, Dalkeith.	1881
Mitchell, Sir Arthur, K.C.B., M.D., LL.D., 43 Drummond Place, Edinburgh.	1881

Ordinary Members as at 31st December, 1898.

(*) Indicates Members of Council. (†) Indicates Life Members.
(‡) Indicates that the Member was admitted prior to the resuscitation of the Society in 1877.

Adam, Thomas, Hazel Bank, Uddingston.	1879
Addie, John, Viewpark, Uddingston.	1889
Aiken, John B., 201 West George Street.	1891
Aitken, John, 328 St. George's Road.	1891
Alexander, D. M., 97 West Regent Street.	1892
Alexander, John, 268 Buchanan Street.	1898
Allan, F. W., 125 Buchanan Street.	1884
Allan, James, Woodend, Helensburgh.	1887
Alston, W. M., C.E., 24 Sardinia Terrace, Hillhead.	1887
Amours, F. J., B.A., 75 Montgomerie Street.	1898
Anderson, Robert, 76 Bath Street.	1892
Anderson, William, F.S.A.Scot., Arns-Brae, New Kilpatrick.	1894

	Date of Admission.
Annan, John, 37 Garnethill Street.	1892
Arthur, Matthew, 78 Queen Street.	1883
†Arthur, Thomas Glen, 78 Queen Street.	1883
Baillie, William Anderson, Glentore, Uddingston.	1889
Baird, J. G. A., M.P., Adamton, Ayrshire.	1891
Balfour, D.D., Sheriff-Substitute of Lanarkshire, County Buildings.	1882
Barnwell, Richard, Elcho House, Balfron.	1888
Barr, Henry, 45 West George Street.	1894
*Barrett, F. T., Librarian, Mitchell Library.	1882
Beckett, Charles E., M.A., LL.B., 163 St. Vincent Street.	1896
Bell, Dugald, 27 Lansdowne Crescent.	1883
†Bell, Sir James, Bart., 7 Marlborough Terrace.	1892
Bell, James, Springbank, Hamilton.	1892
†Bell, James T., Northcote, Dowanhill Gardens.	1892
Bell, John J., Northcote, Dowanhill.	1897
Berry, Sheriff, LL.D., 5 University Gardens.	1888
Beyaert, The Rev. Arthur, Kirkintilloch.	1894
Bilsland, William, F.S.A.Scot., 28 Park Circus.	1895
*Black, William George, F.S.A.Scot., 88 West Regent Street, *Hon. Sec.*	1877
Blackie, J. Robertson, Northbank, Dowanhill Gardens.	1890
Blyth, Robert, 1 Montgomerie Crescent, Kelvinside.	1891
Blythswood, The Right Hon. Lord, LL.D., Blythswood, Renfrew.	1885
Boyd, David T., 19 Wellington Street.	1890
Boyle, A. H., Ruchill House, Maryhill.	1891
Brand, James, C.E., 11 Windsor Circus, Kelvinside.	1891
Brand, James, 10 Marchmont Terrace, Kelvinside.	1889
Bremner, R. L., 11 West Regent Street.	1895
Brogan, Antony D., Anthonbrae, Cambridge Drive, Kelvinside.	1884
Brown, Charles, Kerse, near Falkirk.	1893
Brown, John Arthur, 4 Prince Albert Road, Dowanhill.	1897
*Brown, J. T. T., 97 West Regent Street.	1891

	Date of Admission.
Brown, Robert, 17 Hope Street.	1889
Brownlie, Archibald, of Monkcastle, Bank of Scotland, Barrhead.	1889
Bruce, John, 67 West Nile Street.	1888
Brydall, Robert, F.S.A.Scot., 8 Newton Terrace.	1890
†Bryden, R. Lockhart, B.L., 15 Dalhousie Street.	1893
Buchanan, A. W. Gray, of Parkhall, Polmont.	1895
†Bulloch, Matthew, 48 Prince's Gate, London, S.W.	1883
Burnet, James M., 24 George Square.	1893
Burnet, John, I.A., St. Kilda, Dowanhill Gardens.	‡
Burnet, John James, I.A., F.S.A.Scot., 167 St. Vincent Street.	1882
†Burns, John William, of Kilmahew, Cardross.	1889
Burrows, Ronald M., 21 Kelvinside Terrace, South.	1894
Caldwell, James, F.S.A.Scot., Writer, Paisley.	‡
Cameron, John, Southbank House, Kirkintilloch.	1892
Campbell, Angus, 48 West Regent Street.	1891
Campbell, D. A., 40 Lawrence Street, Partick.	1892
Campbell, J. Archibald, 167 St. Vincent Street.	1885
Campbell, James, of Tullichewan, 137 Ingram Street.	‡
†Campbell, James A., M.P., LL.D., Stracathro, by Brechin.	‡
Campbell, John MacNaught, F.L.S., Kelvingrove Museum.	1881
Campbell, R. C. Graham, Shirvan, Lochgilphead, N.B.	1890
†Cayzer, Sir Charles W., M.P., Ralston, Renfrewshire.	1884
*Chalmers, P. Macgregor, F.S.A.Scot., 95 Bath Street.	1889
Charleson, The Rev. J., The Manse, Thornliebank.	1895
Christie, T. Craig, of Bedlay, by Chryston.	1885
Church, W. R. M., C.A., 104 West George Street.	1890
Clark, David R., M.A., F.S.A.Scot., 8 Park Drive, West.	1897
Clark, William, Gartfern, High Crosshill, Rutherglen.	1885
†Colquhoun, Sir James, of Luss, Bart., Dunclutha, Ore, Hastings.	1885
Colquhoun, Councillor James, LL.D., 158 St. Vincent Street.	1884
Cook, William, 77 St. Vincent Street.	1893

	Date of Admission.
Cook, W. B., 28 Queen Street, Stirling.	1884
Coubrough, John, Blanefield, Stirlingshire.	1877
Coulson, J. Laurie, Farljord, Mauchline.	1890
Cowie, Charles R., Woodend, Partick.	1891
Cree, Thomas Scott, 15 Montgomerie Quadrant, Kelvinside.	1888
†Crerar-Gilbert, D. M., Yr. of Yorkhill, 3 Great Western Terrace.	1888
Crouch, William, C.E., 175 Hope Street.	1887
†Curle, R. Barclay, New Club.	1891
Dalrymple, James, of Woodhead, Kirkintilloch.	‡
Dalzell, J. B., Allan Park, Larkhall.	1897
Dick, David, 7 Seyton Avenue, Langside.	1888
Dick, J. Proudfoot, F.S.A.Scot., Ladycross Lodge, Brockenhurst, Hants.	1880
Dick-Cleland, A. B., of Ravenswood, 28 Coates Gardens, Edinburgh.	1890
Dickson, Jas. S., 97 Bath Street.	1891
†Donald, John R., C.A., 104 West George Street.	1883
†Donald, T. F., C.A., 104 West George Street.	1882
Donnelly, W. A., Middleton House, Milton, by Bowling.	1894
Douglas, Campbell, F.R.I.B.A., 266 St. Vincent Street.	‡
Douglas, William, 22 West Nile Street.	1891
Drew, Alexander, Creggandarroch, Blairmore.	1889
Duncan, J. A., 161 West George Street.	1888
*Duncan, J. Dalrymple, F.S.A.Lond. and Scot., F.R.S.E., 211 Hope Street, *Hon. Secretary*.	1877
Dunlop, Archibald, 25 Wellington Street.	1884
Dunn, Robt. Hunter, 4 Belmont Crescent, Hillhead.	1885
†Dyer, Henry, C.E., M.A., 8 Highburgh Terrace.	1886
Easton, Walter, 125 Buchanan Street.	1882
Edmiston, John, 41 West Nile Street.	1886
*†Edwards, John, F.S.A.Scot., 4 Great Western Terrace, Kelvinside.	1891
Eskdale, John L., 80 Argyle Street.	1891

	Date of Admission.
Ewing, William, 62 Buchanan Street.	1891
*Eyre, The Most Rev. Archbishop, LL.D., D.D., F.S.A.Scot., 6 Bowmont Gardens, Kelvinside, *Vice-President.*	1888
†Faulds, Andrew Wilson, F.S.A.Scot., 111 Union Street.	1882
Ferguson, A. A., 48 M'Alpine Street.	‡
Fergusson, D. S., Ballancleroch, Campsie Glen, N.B.	1891
*†Ferguson, Professor J., LL.D., F.S.A.Lond. and Scot., 13 Newton Place.	1878
Fleming, Alexander, of Kilmaho, 168 West George Street.	1883
Fleming, James, Treasurer, Corporation Gas Department, City Chambers.	1893
†Fleming, James B., of Kelvinside, Beaconsfield, Kelvinside.	1881
Fleming, John, 1 Lynedoch Terrace.	1883
Fotheringham, Thomas Bremner, 65 West Regent Street.	1891
†Fowler, John, 5 Derby Street, West.	1884
Fraser, J. W., 168 West George Street.	1886
†Fraser, M. P., Advocate, Edinburgh.	1883
Fraser, Melville, 31 St. Vincent Place.	1884
Freeman, W. Weber, 145 West Nile Street.	1888
Galbraith, Thomas L., Town-Clerk, Stirling.	1889
Garroway, James R., New Club.	1882
Gemmill, J. Leiper, 162 St Vincent Street.	1890
Gibson, William, 77 Queen Street.	1885
†Gillies, William, 204 West George Street.	1882
Gordon, The Rev. J. F. S., D.D., Beith.	1891
Gourlay, Robert, Manager, Bank of Scotland, St. Vincent Place.	1888
Gow, Leonard, 45 Renfield Street.	1889
†Graham, James, LL.D., F.R.S.E., 11 Claremont Terrace.	1891
Graham, James, Jun., 198 West George Street.	1885
Graham, John, C.A., 212 West George Street.	1882
†Graham, Patrick, C.A., 212 West George Street.	1890

	Date of Admission.
†Graham, R. C., of Skipness, Skipness House, Argyllshire.	1888
†Grahame, James, C.A., Scottish Liberal Club, Edinburgh.	1882
Gray, George, 72 Hutcheson Street.	1883
Greig, Andrew, 36 Belmont Gardens, Hillhead.	1882
Grierson, Henry, Craigend Park, Liberton, Edinburgh.	1883
Grieve, W. Weir, 179 W. George Street.	1882
*Guy, Robert, 120 West Regent Street.	1878
Hamilton, Chas. Edw., 1 North Park, Hillhead.	1895
Harrison, The Right Rev. Bishop, D.D., 25 Burnbank Gardens.	1897
Hedderwick, A. W. H., M.A., 79 St. George's Place.	1883
Henderson, Thomas Beath, M.D., 155 Bath Street.	1894
Herron, Hugh, 157 West George Street.	1883
Hewison, The Rev. J. King, M.A., The Manse, Rothesay.	1891
Heys, Zechariah George, South Arthurlie, Barrhead.	1893
†Hill, William Henry, LL.D., 194 Ingram Street.	‡
Hogg, Charles P., C.E., 175 Hope Street.	1884
†Hoggan, George B., 194 Ingram Street.	1885
*Honeyman, John, R.S.A., F.R.I.B.A., 140 Bath Street.	‡
Honeyman, P. S., 88 West Regent Street.	1883
†Hunt, John, Fingarry, Milton of Campsie.	1885
Hunter, The Rev. David, D.D., The Manse, Galashiels.	1886
†Hunter, J. R. S., LL.D., Daleville, Carluke.	1891
Hunter, Wm. Sutherland, Kildonan, Maxwell Drive, Pollokshields.	1893
Hurry, Alfred A., 136 Wellington Street.	1884
Hutchison, Thomas H., 4 Windsor Quadrant.	1884
Jameson, Robert, 147 St. Vincent Street.	1885
Johnston, The Rev. A. Orrock, D.D., 3 Bowmont Terrace, Kelvinside.	1878
Johnston, David, 160 West George Street.	1882
Johnstone, William, B.L., City Chambers.	1891
Keith, Duncan, 13 West Regent Street.	1883

	Date of Admission.
Kelvin, The Right Honourable Lord, F.R.S., D.C.L., LL.D., The College.	1893
Kennedy, James, Chesters, New Kilpatrick.	1887
†Keppie, John, 140 Bath Street.	1891
Ker, Charles, C.A., 115 St. Vincent Street.	1887
†Ker, T. Ripley, of Dougalston, Milngavie.	1879
Ker, William D., 140 Hope Street.	1892
Ker, David Smith, 26 Bothwell Street.	1891
Key, William, 109 Hope Street.	1897
Kidston, William, 50 West Regent Street.	1885
Kincaid, Thomas, 9 Lansdowne Crescent.	1889
King, Sir James, of Campsie, Bart., LL.D., 115 Wellington Street.	1883
Kirkpatrick, Andrew J., 179 West George Street.	1893
Knight, Charles A., 21 St. Vincent Place.	1886
Laidlaw, Rev. Andrew, 3 Derby Crescent.	1896
Laird, John, 4 North Court, Royal Exchange.	1889
†Lang, James, 9 Crown Gardens, Dowanhill.	1883
Lang, William, Cross Park, Partick.	1893
Lindsay, Charles C., C.E., 167 St. Vincent Street.	1894
*Lindsay, The Rev. Professor T. M., D.D., 37 Westbourne Gardens.	1877
Lodge, Professor Richard, M.A., 10 University Gardens.	1895
MacBrayne, David, 17 Exchange Square.	1885
M'Cowan, David, 7 Lynedoch Crescent.	1891
Macdonald, George, M.A., 41 Lilybank Gardens.	1897
*Macdonald, James, LL.D., F.S.A.Scot., 49 Fountainhall Road, Edinburgh.	1884
Macfarlane, John, 11 Camphill Quadrant, Langside.	1886
MacGeorge, B. B., 24 George Square.	1882

	Date of Admission.
M'Gibbon, Alexander, 109 Hope Street.	1897
M'Gibbon, W. F., 221 West George Street.	1897
M'Gregor, James, 8 Kersland Street, Hillhead.	1891
M'Grigor, Alexander, 172 St. Vincent Street.	1883
Macharg, E. Simpson, C.A., 69 Buchanan Street.	1885
M'Intyre John, 33 Oswald Street.	1897
Mackenzie, Alexander, Writer, Paisley.	1891
†Mackinlay, David, 6 Great Western Terrace.	‡
*†Mackinlay, James M., F.S.A.Lond. and Scot., 4 Westbourne Gardens.	1886
Mackinlay, Wm. M., 16 Kelvinside Gardens.	1895
Mackirdy, W. A. Scott, of Birkwood, Lesmahagow.	1898
Maclae, A. Crum, of Cathkin, 147 St. Vincent Street.	1886
Maclay, D. T., 169 West George Street.	1882
Maclay, James, M.A., LL.B., 169 West George Street.	1888
Maclay, William, 7 Eildon Villas, Mount Florida.	1891
M'Lean, Allan, 41 West George Street.	1883
†MacLehose, James J., M.A., F.S.A.Scot., 61 St. Vincent Street.	1882
MacLehose, Robert, M.A., 61 St. Vincent Street.	1882
MacLellan, Robert, Conservative Club.	1891
Macleod, The Rev. W. H., Buchanan Manse, Drymen.	1898
Macmillan, William, M.B., C.M., 382 Shields Road.	1897
Macnair, Thomas, 27 St. Vincent Place.	1895
Maconechy, Robert, Golf View, Prestwick.	1882
Macquaker, Thomas, Ardshalloch, Hamilton Drive, Pollokshields, W.	1890
Main, John Bell, Portland Park, Hamilton.	1891
Mann, John, C.A., 137 West George Street.	1891
†Marwick, Sir James D., LL.D., City Chambers.	1878
†Menzies, James, Mount Feargan, Bothwell.	1884
Miller, A. Lindsay, Architect, 122 Wellington Street.	1898
Miller, D. S., 8 Royal Crescent.	1881
Mitchell, A. Moncrieff, LL.B., 160 West George Street.	1885

	Date of Admission.
*†Mitchell, John Oswald, LL.D., F.S.A.Scot., 69 East Howard Street, *Vice-President.*	1882
Moore, Robert T., C.E., 13 Clairmont Gardens.	1891
Muir, James, C.A., 149 West George Street.	1885
Muir, The Rev. Pearson Macadam, D.D., 1 Athole Gardens.	1897
Muir, Sir John, Bart., 6 Park Gardens.	1889
†Munro, R., M.D., F.S.A.Scot., 48 Manor Place, Edinburgh.	1883
*Murdoch, J. B., F.S.A.Scot., Capelrig, Mearns.	‡
*Murray, David, LL.D., F.S.A.Lond. and Scot., 169 West George Street, *President.*	1881
*Murray, Professor G. G. A., The College.	1890
Murray, John Bruce, 17 University Gardens, Hillhead.	1886
Nairne, J. Stuart, F.R.C.S.E., 197 Pitt Street.	1890
*†Neilson, George, F.S.A.Scot., Central Police Chambers.	1890
Newbery, F. H., School of Art, 264 Sauchiehall Street.	1894
Nicol, Donald N., M.P., Ardmarnock, by Tigh-na-bruaich.	1888
Orr, James Basden, 8 Royal Exchange Buildings.	1891
Orr, John F., 88 St. Vincent Street.	1883
Park, Alexander, Croy House, Croy.	1891
Paterson, Oscar, 118 West Regent Street.	1889
Paton, James, F.L.S., Camphill House, Crossmyloof.	1884
Patterson, A., M.D., 22 India Street.	1882
Pearson, Alexander, Sheriff-Clerk Depute, County Buildings.	1885
Petrie, James A., Clydeville, Bowling.	1885
Pickering, R. Y., Braxfield, Lanark.	1891
Pirrie, Robert, F.S.A.Scot., 9 Buckingham Terrace.	1896
Prentice, Thomas, 175 West George Street.	1890
Provan, James, 40 West Nile Street.	1879
Reid, James A., 172 St. Vincent Street.	1882
Reid, James Drummond, 39 Finlay Drive, Dennistoun.	1894

	Date of Admission.
Pirrie, Robert, F.S.A.Scot., 9 Buckingham Terrace.	1896
Prentice, Thomas, 175 West George Street.	1890
Provan, James, 40 West Nile Street.	1879
Reid, James A., 172 St. Vincent Street.	1882
Reid, Thomas, M.D., 11 Elmbank Street.	1887
Renwick, Robert, Depute Town-Clerk, City Chambers.	1882
Robb, James, Sen., 90 Trongate.	1882
Roberton, James D., 1 Park Terrace, East.	1883
Roberts, Andrew, F.S.A.Scot., Commercial Bank House, Callander.	1879
Robertson, The Rev. Alexander, Manse of Haggs, by Bonnybridge.	1891
Ross, David, M.A., LL.D., Normal Training College, New City Road.	1887
†Ross, John M., 2 Devonshire Gardens.	1888
Roxburgh, George R., 137 Ingram Street.	1883
Ruddock, John W., 3 Middleton Terrace, Ibrox.	1884
Rundell, Richard Cooper, Royal Exchange Buildings.	1888
Rutherford, Andrew, M.A., 150 Ingram Street.	1898
Salmon, W. Forrest, F.R.I.B.A., 197 St. Vincent Street.	1885
Scott, John, 247 Sauchiehall Street.	1893
†Shand-Harvey, James W., of Castle-Semple, Lochwinnoch.	1891
Shaughnessy, Joseph, Bellevue, Rutherglen.	1890
Shaw-Stewart, M. H., M.P., Carnock, Larbert.	1892
Sinclair, Alexander, Ajmere Lodge, 41 Cathkin Road, Langside.	1884
Skirving, Alex., Architect, 121 West Regent Street.	1898
Smith, Andrew, F.S.A.Scot., of Fairlaw, Broompark, Lanark.	1897
†Smith, J. Guthrie, 54 West Nile Street.	1879
Somerville, John, 2 Millar Terrace, Rutherglen.	1888
Sorley, Robert, 1 Buchanan Street.	1887
Speirs, A. A., of Elderslie, Houston House, Houston.	1898
Spencer, Charles Louis, 121 West George Street.	1894

	Date of Admission.
*†Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John, of Pollok, Bart., M.P., F.S.A.Scot., Pollok, Pollokshaws.	1890
Stirling, Colonel, of Gargunnock, Gargunnock House, Stirling.	1890
*Story, The Rev. R. Herbert, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History, The College, *Vice-President.*	1887
Stout, Thomas, 14 Belmont Crescent.	1894
Strachan, R. U., Sheriff-Substitute of Lanarkshire, 9 Crown Circus, Dowanhill.	1896
Sturrock, Peter, of Baltersan, London Road, Kilmarnock.	1860
Swan, Robert M. W., 15 Walmer Crescent.	1893
Thomson, M. C., 25 Hope Street.	1885
Turnbull, George D., 10 India Street.	1883
Turnbull, John, 50 West Regent Street.	1890
Turner, William, Rachan House, Helensburgh.	1883
Ure, George Albert, Hope Park, Bonnybridge, Stirlingshire.	1891
*Walker, Geo. J., C.A., 150 St. Vincent Street, *Hon. Treasurer.*	1895
Walker, Robert, Secretary, Glasgow Fine Art Institute, 175 Sauchiehall Street.	1893
Wallace, T. M., Douglas Gardens, Uddingston.	1884
†Watson, Duncan, 17 Newton Street.	1887
Watson, Rev. David, 40 Granby Terrace.	1897
†Watson, T. L., 166 Bath Street.	1881
Watt, The Rev. J. B. A., The Manse, Cawder, by Bishopbriggs.	1888
Weddel, James, Park Villa, Uddingston.	1882
Whitelaw, Alexander, of Gartshore, Kirkintilloch.	1891
†Whitelaw, Chas. E., 168 Bath Street.	1889
Whitelaw, Thomas, 112 Wellington Street.	1886
Whyte, John, Master of Works, City Chambers.	1891
Williamson, George, Municipal Buildings, Wallace Place, Greenock.	1882

	Date of Admission.
Wilson, John, of Airdrie, M.P., Airdrie House.	1887
Wilson, Robert, Procurator-Fiscal, County Buildings, Hamilton.	1885
Wingate, J. B., 102 Hope Street.	‡
Wingate, Walter E., 4 Bowmont Terrace, Kelvinside.	1887
Wood, H. K., 17 Rosslyn Terrace.	1897
Wood, William J., 38 Cochrane Street.	1894
†Wordie, John, F.S.A.Scot., 42 Montgomerie Drive, Kelvinside.	1884
Wylie, John, 9 Athole Gardens, Kelvinside.	1897
Young, George Burn, 45 West George Street.	1883
*Young, Professor J., M.D., 38 Cecil Street, Hillhead.	‡
Young, William, R.S.W., 65 West Regent Street.	1896

Past Presidents of the Society since 1877.

1877-80. The Very Rev. John Caird, D.D., LL.D., Principal of the University of Glasgow.

1880-83. John Young, M.D., Professor of Geology, University of Glasgow.

1883-86. John Veitch, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Logic and Rhetoric, University of Glasgow.

1886-88. The Rev. Thomas M. Lindsay, D.D., Professor of Church History, Free Church College, Glasgow.

1888-91. John Honeyman, R.S.A., F.R.I.B.A.

1891-94. John Ferguson, LL.D., F.S.A.Lond. and Scot., Professor of Chemistry, University of Glasgow.

1894-95. Colin Dunlop Donald, F.S.A.Scot.